NEW SERIES No. 18.

SELECTIONS FROM THE RECORDS

OF THE OFFICE OF THE

FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB.

Published by Authority.

No. 4.

CONTENTS.

No. LXXII.—Papers relating to the Ala-Lambardari Inams in Six Districts of the Lahore and Rawalpindi Divisions.

Lahore:
THE "CIVIL AND MILITARY GAZETTE" PRESS.
Contractors to the Punjab Government.
1896.

NEW SERIES No. 18.

SELECTIONS FROM THE RECORDS

OF THE OFFICE OF THE

FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB.

Published by Authority.

No. 44.

CONTENTS.

Lahore:
THE "CIVIL AND MILITARY GAZETTE" PRESS,
Contractors to the Punjab Government.
1896.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

NOTE.

THE correspondence printed in this volume relating to *Ala-Lambardári* arrangements should be read in continuation of that published in Financial Commissioner's Selection volume serial No. 20, subject No. XLVIII issued in 1875, which deals with the previous history of the question.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE GURDASPUR DISTRICT.

No. 824, dated 28th November 1889.

From—J. M. DOUIE, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,
To—The Offg. Junior Secretary to Government, Punjab.

I AM directed to submit, for the orders of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, a printed copy of correspondence regarding the *ala-lambardári* system in force in those districts of the Lahore and Ráwalpindi Divisions which were settled under the supervision of Mr. Prinsep, together with a note on the subject recorded by the Second Financial Commissioner.

W. M. YOUNG, Esquire, C. S.

No. 490, dated 18th July 1887.

From—W. COLDSTREAM, Esquire, Offg. Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division,
To—R. G. THOMSON, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

IN reply to your No. 188 C., dated 4th August 1886, I have the honor to submit a letter, No. 162 of 8th current, from the Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur, to my address, in which he submits proposals regarding the abolition of the office of ala-lambardár and resumption of their revenue-free assignments in the Gurdáspur District.

2. I regret that this reference has reached me at a time when I am not able to deal with it at all so fully as its importance deserves, for it has often occupied my attention since I have had charge of a district.

3. I will, however, shortly state my opinions upon Mr. Dane's proposals as summarised in the 11th paragraph of his letter.

(1). I agree in the desirability of abolishing the system of chief lambardárs, except in the case of large villages having a *jama* of Rs. 2,000 or more, and having five or more headmen. I do not think Government gets for the cost incurred in percentage fees and assignments anything like an equivalent in work done or service rendered: the election with its appeals is a never-ending source of useless trouble to the Deputy Commissioner and apt to be a periodically recurring occasion of strife and jealousy in the village. In the larger villages, where the headmen are numerous, it is convenient to have one individual to deal with; therefore in such I would retain the post. I may be excused from adverting here to the *mode of election*, a question not immediately raised by Mr. Dane's reference, but one which is of great importance and which is now probably before the Financial Commissioner. I think it most desirable to give less prominence to the results of *voting* on these occasions. There is a great deal of bribery, I believe, and it cannot be stopped. I would allow voting, but would in no case make it imperative either to take votes or to abide by the results of a poll.

(2). I entirely agree with Mr. Dane in the usefulness of *ináms*. I do not think you want *many* of these now that the system and aid of zaildárs has been fully introduced. But it is useful to have rewards available for bestowal on those who have made themselves useful to the local authorities or evinced public spirit and active loyalty. I would have six or seven in each tahsíl, and (*a*) I would make these absolutely the reward of good service, or an incentive to it, without any regard whatever to hereditary claims; (*b*) an *inám* should not as a matter of course be awarded, or re-assigned, on lapse, but only when, in the Deputy Commissioner's opinion, there was a person fit to receive it; (*c*) I would like to see it arranged that the assignment be not necessarily confined for the period of settlement, to any particular village, but that it be transferable and made in the village which might appear to the Deputy Commissioner to be for the time most suitable with reference to the purposes of the grant.

(3). As regards the immediate resumption of the grants now held by the lambardárs, I do not think it would be desirable, as proposed by Mr. Dane, to resume these at once. I would allow existing incumbents to enjoy them during tenure of office and good behaviour, but would announce at once that on lapses occurring they will not be re-assigned. And as regards the tenure by which the chief lambardárs held portions of the common land as a grant assigned to them at Settlement in virtue of their office, I would be inclined to hold, whenever the question is raised by an application for partition or otherwise, that the land is still village common, and that the co-sharers can, if they please, demand *málikána* upon it; that it can, if necessary, be partitioned; that (following to some extent the *rúbkár* of the Commissioner of Amritsar, dated 5th February 1867) the chief lambardár must be regarded as *tenant*, for period of office only, of all *máfi* land which he occupied as waste at the time of assignment; but that such limited right of occupancy shall cease

with the determination of office or of existing lives, and then the occupants shall only have such preferential cultivating rights in the land as accrue to any co-sharer cultivating the waste.

4. I do not think the *rúbkár* of 1867, when it was written, can have occasioned the people much surprise. I doubt whether they could have wondered, generally speaking, at Government, by issuing it, making away with the proprietary rights in the village, because our rule was but recently established, and our liberal policy of conferring proprietary right in the land was perhaps not then fully understood or appreciated. It could not be done now except with consent of the people; but it could, I think, have been done then *without consulting the people* under a kind of fiction or assumption of their consent and without occasioning remark. And it is to be remembered that it was done *before* the passing of the Tenancy Act and the consequent crystallization of tenures under our system.

5. This question of the liability of these *máfis* to partition has recently been before me in appeal, and doubtless will soon come to be considered in connection with cases by the Financial Commissioner.

6. No doubt an early decision of the question as asked for by Mr. Dane will be a considerable convenience.

No. 162, dated 8th July 1887.

From—R. M. Dane, Esquire, Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

In the course of the correspondence regarding the principles upon which revenue-free assignments in this district should be treated during the Settlement operations now in progress, I expressed an opinion to the effect that all revenue-free assignments held by head lambardárs should be resumed, that the office of head lambardár itself might with advantage be abolished. The Financial Commissioner, in his Senior Secretary's letter to your predecessor's address, No. 188, dated 4th August 1886, directed the submission of definite proposals upon the subject, and these proposals I have now the honor to submit.

2. I think I may safely say that there is a strong consensus of opinion among officers of experience to the effect that the chief *lambardári* system has not answered the expectations that were formed at the time of its introduction in 1864. The idea of creating in each village a man of substance and position, who would be primarily responsible for carrying out all orders of Government and for the maintenance of peace and order, was an attractive one, but experience has shown that it is rarely, if ever, possible to secure men of the kind, and in the vast majority of instances the appointment of a chief headman does not benefit either Government or the village which he represents. The government of the village by one strong man, upon the reality of which Messrs. Prinsep and Brandreth so strongly insisted, is decidedly in my experience the exception rather than the rule, and in many cases the chief lambardár is a weak, insignificant creature without influence in the village, and afraid of showing himself to British Officers for fear of displaying his own incompetence. Village elections are too often no test of real fitness, and the fact that the appointments are usually made in accordance with the votes of the co-sharers causes the successful candidate to regard the emoluments of the office as his right, and deadens his sense of responsibility to Government for the proper performance of his duties.

3. The appointments, moreover, are frequently the source of much heart-burning and jealousy, as predicted by Mr. Melvill in his minute, dated 25th July 1863. The occurrence of a vacancy in the office in any village where there are two or more lambardárs generally splits the village into factions, and, as the result of the election is often indecisive and the claims of the contending candidates evenly balanced, the order of the Deputy Commissioner making the appointment forms the subject of appeal after appeal until the parties are thoroughly embittered.

4. The cost of these appointments also is considerable. The chief headmen in this district receive as percentage on the revenue a sum of Rs. 12,007 and hold revenue-free 14,662 ghumáos of village common land assessable at Rs. 17,357 per annum, making a total of nearly Rs. 30,000 per annum.

5. I strongly recommend, therefore, that opportunity be taken of the existence of Settlement operations in the district to abolish the appointment. I do not of course recommend that the present incumbents should be dismissed, but the abolition can be effected gradually by allowing appointments to lapse as they become vacant. The appointment was created at Settlement, and, if its abolition be announced at the present Settlement, the zamíndárs will, I believe, accept the inevitable without much grumbling. If a complete abolition of the appointment does not find favour with Government, I recommend that the appointment may be restricted to large villages paying a *jama* not less than Rs. 2,000 and having not less than five headmen. There is something to be said in favor of retaining the appointment in villages

of this kind, though the difficulty of securing a man, who will be recognised by the other lambardárs as their chief, will always be so great that I think the complete abolition of the appointment is preferable, more especially if a certain number of *safed-poshi ináms* are created in the district, as has recently been done in Jullundur and other districts under settlement. I am much in favour of this system, and, if my present proposals are approved, I am prepared to submit recommendations on the subject. An *inám* will always carry with it obligations and is conferred as a reward of merit, whereas the remuneration of a chief headman is secured to him, whether he be competent or incompetent. A District Officer ought to have some means of rewarding men who make themselves useful to him in the district administration, and at present he can do nothing for such men, unless favoured by accident.

6. As regards the remuneration at present enjoyed by the chief headmen, I strongly recommend, whether the appointment be abolished or retained, that the *máfi* grants which they hold be at once resumed. They are merely held during the pleasure of Government and the one per cent. on the revenue which every chief headman enjoys is ample remuneration for any services that he is ever called upon to perform. The assignments are most unpopular with the zamíndárs, and this unpopularity has now occasioned a serious administrative difficulty, which forms one of the principal reasons for the present reference. To explain this difficulty some reference to the early history of the assignments and principles upon which they were made appears to be necessary. The principle of endowing the appointment of chief headman from the proceeds of the common land of the village was first mooted by Mr. E. Prinsep and received the warm support of Mr. A. Brandreth. The proposal was sharply criticised by Mr. Melvill, who appears to have at once grasped its real character and effect, and the arguments against the advisability of adopting any such form of remuneration which are set forth in paragraph 12 of Mr. Melvill's minute of 25th July 1863 appear to be unanswerable. The Financial Commissioner, however, in his letter to Government, No. 499, dated 26th September 1864, paragraph 13, supported the views of Messrs. Brandreth and Prinsep, and quoted with approval a remark of Mr. Brandreth's to the following effect:—"Government does set aside portions for the chaukidár and the village does for its mosque: Government may, therefore, equally well do it for the Mukaddam, and the village may as well do it for its chief representatives." Mr. Prinsep's proposals, which it seems unnecessary to summarise, were accordingly recommended to Government, and in Government letter No. 1005, dated 29th October 1864, the appointment of chief headmen was sanctioned, the Lieutenant-Governor directing that one per cent. of the revenue should be set apart for the payment of the chief headmen and for *ináms*, and that one-tenth of the proceeds of jungle or uncultivated waste should be distributed to the chief headmen, and that one-tenth of the proceeds of all land brought into cultivation during the term of settlement by their exertions should also be assigned to them.

7. As a matter of fact, however, these orders of the Lieutenant-Governor do not appear to have been closely observed, and, as originally recommended by Mr. Prinsep in his letter of 12th August 1862 to the Financial Commissioner, a portion of the common land in each village was assigned to the chief headmen. The circumstances of the assignments differ widely in accordance with local conditions. In some cases the chief headman merely received the revenue of the land assigned, but in the majority of instances he was placed in possession of waste or fallow land, and has hitherto enjoyed practically full proprietary right in the land assigned.

8. Cases have now occurred in which the co-sharers of the chief lambardár have claimed partition of the land thus assigned, and in such cases I have hitherto ordered partition on the application of any large majority of the co-sharers, as I do not think that partition can be refused in law. With Mr. Melvill I hold that Government had no power to resume the proprietary right in the land and confer it at will upon an individual, nor indeed is it quite clear that such a course was ever intended, though passages in the correspondence might be held to bear such an interpretation. In paragraph 9 of his note, dated 10th October 1863, Mr. Prinsep distinctly disclaims any intention of such confiscation of private interests, and both he and Mr. Brandreth appear to have framed their proposals on the understanding that such assignments would be acceptable to the village community at large. Whatever may have been the case in 1864, however, there seems no doubt now that the zamíndárs are most strongly averse to allowing the chief headmen to remain in cultivating occupancy of the assigned land, and in Tahsíl Shakargarh an enormous number of applications for partitions of the land have been presented.

9. As above stated, there cannot, in my opinion, be any doubt that both in law and equity the co-sharers are entitled to a share in these assigned lands, and that the chief headman is entitled to nothing more than what the Government itself is entitled to realize from the land, *viz.*, the Government revenue. The fact that the land may have been assigned as *banjar* and may have been subsequently brought under cultivation by the chief headman does not, in my opinion, give him any right to the land other than such preferential claim as may be acquired by any shareholder breaking up waste to receive at a partition as much of the land so broken up as may fall to his share. These views, however, have not, I am bound to say, found universal acceptance, and in some cases suits have been brought by shareholders for possession of their share in this land and have been rejected by the civil courts. In

some of these decisions, which have recently come under my notice, reference is made to a *rúbkár* of the Commissioner of the Amritsar Division, dated 5th February 1867, in which it is laid down, for guidance of the Extra Assistant Commissioners and Tahsíldárs in the Division that only the Government interest in the lands comprised in these grants has been assigned to the chief lambardárs, and co-sharers can, if they please, take *málikána* from them, but that, if the land assigned was waste at the time of assignment, the chief headman or his tenant must be considered to have a right to cultivate the land and will not be liable to ejectment.

10. These orders, it is almost needless to say, conflict with the provisions of the Tenancy Act, but the existence of such orders and of decrees of court based upon them renders the question exceedingly complicated, and, now that the existence of the orders has been brought to my notice, I am uncertain how to proceed. Pending the receipt of a reply to this reference, I have stopped all further proceedings in cases that have been instituted for partition of assigned lands. If Government directs the immediate resumption of the assignments, the difficulty will be solved; as the chief lambardár will then unquestionably merely occupy in regard to the *máfi* the position of a shareholder breaking up a portion of the common land, and the land will be liable to partition. If, however, the assignments are not resumed, I shall be compelled to solicit instructions as to how these cases are to be dealt with Are the principles laid down in the Commissioner's *rúbkár* of 5th February 1867 to be observed, or is the chief lambardár to be regarded as a tenant-at-will of all *máfi* land he holds in excess of his proper share in the common land? The matter is both important and urgent, and will, I trust, receive early attention.

11. To summarise my proposals, therefore, I recommend—

(1) that the appointment of chief lambardár be gradually abolished, or that it be restricted to the case of large villages paying a revenue of not less than Rs. 2,000 and having five or more headmen;

(2) that, if the appointment of chief headman be entirely abolished, a certain number of *safed-poshi ináms* be created in the district;

(3) that under any circumstances, whether the appointment of chief headman be abolished or retained, the revenue-free assignments which they now hold be at once resumed.

Proposal No. 3 is urgent and requires early orders, and may conveniently be disposed of, if necessary, apart from the general question.

No. 6755, dated 3rd December 1887.

From—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 490, dated the 18th July last, with which you forward a letter from the Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur, containing proposals for the abolition of ála-lambardárs in that district and the resumption of the revenue-free assignments made to them at the last Settlement. In reply, I am directed to convey the following remarks :—

2. The Financial Commissioners are not prepared to give any immediate orders in respect of the reduction or continuance of the office of chief headman. This part of the case is under separate consideration. It must be decided after a careful and deliberate weighing of the merits of the question; and it would be matter for regret if the reduction of an office of some emolument were too directly connected with the re-assessment operations now in progress.

3. The question of the terms on which land, the common property of the village land owners, was assigned at last Settlement to the chief headman as a part of the emoluments of his office is a distinct one and can be disposed of independently of the other questions above referred to.

4. In order to decide this question, the Financial Commissioners have examined very carefully such portions of the correspondence of the last Settlement on the subject as is still available and of which the principal portions have been printed in Selection No. 20 from the records of this office; and the conclusions at which the Financial Commissioners have arrived are based mainly on the portions of that correspondence which are referred to in the margin.

Paragraph 12 of Mr. P. Melvill's memorandum, dated 25th July 1863.
Paragraphs 15 and 22 of Mr. Prinsep's letter, dated 12th August 1862.
Paragraphs 9 and 10 of Mr. Prinsep's remarks on Mr. Melvill's memorandum.
Paragraph 13 of Financial Commissioner's No. 499, dated 26th September 1864.

5. The Financial Commissioners are satisfied from a perusal of these papers that, in creating these grants to village headmen and to zaildárs, the Settlement Commissioner and Financial Commissioners had no intention of interfering with the ownership of the land in favor of village officials contrary to current usage and the acertained wishes of the land owners. It was assumed that the assignment, not only of the land revenue, but also of the actual possession and enjoyment of limited areas of village common to zaildárs and village headmen, in return for their services was a measure which by reason of its consonance with old feelings and usages would have the consent of the land owners.

6. The Financial Commissioners are of opinion that we must assume that the land owners did thus assent to the arrangements thus made at the last Settlement. They gave that assent either with reference to previous usage or because they regarded these arrangements as part and parcel of the Settlement then being made.

7. That Settlement has now expired. And, in dealing with cases in which the land owners of an estate now express their unwillingness to allow an office bearer to enjoy common land as part of the emoluments of his office, we should bear in mind that the officers who introduced these arrangements disclaimed any intention to act in opposition to the wishes of the land owners or to interfere with rights of ownership. The Government assigned to the office bearer the revenue due on these lands, and were assured that the land owners on their part would assign the free use of the land to the office bearer. The office bearer was released from the payment of land revenue on certain portions of the village common by the pleasure of Government; but in his capacity as occupant of that land he was the tenant of the land owners. If the Settlement record contains any express provision of the nature of an agreement, stating that the office bearer holds for so long as the office lasts or for the term of Settlement, that agreement should be interpreted and supported, as the provisions of the Tenancy Act may require. But, in the absence of any express provision in the Settlement record that the office bearer holds these lands for so long as his office lasts or for the term of Settlement, the Financial Commissioners think that the original correspondence will not support the contention that the office bearer has held or was intended to hold in a manner adverse to the ordinary rights of the land owners of the estate.

No. 292, dated 23rd April 1888.

From—C. M. Rivaz, Esquire, Offg. Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division,

To—T. Gordon Walker, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

With reference to your letter No. 6755 of the 3rd December last, I have the honor to forward, for the Financial Commissioner's orders, copy of a further communication from the Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur, No. 194 of the 16th instant, on the subject of the revenue-free assignments which were made to the village chief headmen in the Gurdáspur District at the last Settlement.

2. The main point on which Mr. L. Dane now asks for instructions is as to what action should be taken in cases where land so assigned has been carried away by the river in riverain villages. Should fresh assignments be made in such cases or not? The matter must depend, I think, on whatever decision is come to in regard to continuing these *ála-lambardári máfis* at all, now that the Settlement for which these were granted is expiring. If it be decided to continue them generally, then it seems but fair that, where a chief headman has lost his assignment by river action, a fresh one should, whenever practicable, be granted in exchange, otherwise the chief headmen of riverain villages are placed in a worse position as regards the emoluments of their office than those of the rest of the district. But I would venture strongly to urge that, considering the numerous difficulties which are created by the maintenance of these *ala-lambardári máfis*, it is highly desirable that opportunity should be taken of the district having come under re-settlement to resume all such assignments throughout the district, and to restrict the remuneration of the chief headmen in future (supposing it is decided to maintain such appointments) to the one per cent. on the land revenue which such village officers ordinarily receive elsewhere. There would be no breach of faith, it seems to me, even as regards existing incumbents, if such general resumption were enforced, for, apart from the question whether these assignments were made under proper authority or not, it seems clear that they were made for the term of Settlement only, and as that term is now expiring, and the maintenance of such *máfis* is creating considerable administrative difficulties, the best solution is, I would urge, to resume them all.

3. The question discussed by Mr. Dane in his 6th paragraph as to such assignees or their heirs having acquired occupancy rights in the land so assigned under Section 5 (1) (*d*) of the new Tenancy Act must, if it be raised in any case, be dealt with judicially. I should think that, ordinarily, at all events, any such claim would be barred by Section 10 of the Act.

No. 194, dated 16th April 1888.

From—L. W. DANE, Esquire, Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

IN continuation of the correspondence ending with your No. 831, dated 6th December 1887, I have the honor to ask for instructions on the following points. In riverain villages it occasionally happens that the land of which the revenue is assigned to the ála-lambardár is swept away. Under Rule 33 II. D. of the Rules under Act XXXIII of 1871 a plot of which the revenue was assigned once swept away has ceased to exist, and the assignee has no claim to the revenue of alluvial deposits afterwards formed on the same site, except under certain circumstances.

2. In this district the custom in regard to the ownership of land swept away varies. In some villages such land is treated as *shámilát*, and when thrown up again is divided amongst the whole body of proprietors in proportion to their shares. In others, while treated as *shámilát* when carried away, the owners whose land was diluviated are entitled, on its being thrown up again, to receive first the amount so swept away, and any balance is then divided proportionately amongst the whole of the owners. In neither of these cases, however, can the original owner claim any particular plot as the land which belonged to him before the diluvion occurred, and under Rule 33 the ala-lambardár would not apparently be entitled to recover his *máfi*. In villages the original owner is entitled to claim the exact plot swept away when land is thrown up on the same spot, and in such cases the ala-lambardár could claim presumably a release of the land revenue on the plot in his favour.

3. We have in this way a most anomalous state of things in regard to these grants. In all cases of diluvion the ala-lambardárs in riverain villages lose their assignments, and consequently receive less pay than similar village officers in villages not subject to river action. In some cases of alluvion they seem to be entitled to claim a fresh release of the assignment, though this has not, as far as I can ascertain, been granted in this district, and in others they are not so entitled.

4. I should be glad to know if the view I have taken of the meaning of Rule 33 is correct or not, as I have received several applications from ala-lambardárs of riverain villages asking for fresh assignments on the ground that, owing to the *máfi* plot having been swept away, they are in a worse position than similar officers in villages more favourably situated. If correct, should any steps be taken to equalize the emoluments of ala-lambardárs in these villages by granting fresh assignments to them, or resuming the assignments in other villages?

5. In letter No. 6755 of 3rd December 1887, from Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner to your address, the question of these *máfis* has been dealt with as if they were assignments of the revenue of common land only. This is not always the case, as in many villages holdings held in separate proprietary right have been assigned to the ála-lambardárs over and above their *pachotra* of 1 per cent. on the Government revenue of the estate. Where this has been done, should the assignment be treated as one made without proper authority, and dealt with under paragraphs 4 and 3 of Financial Commissioner's Circular No. 3 of 1888? It seems also very doubtful whether the assignments of revenue of common land even in this district are generally authorized by the terms of Government letter No. 1005 of 29th October 1864, as the waste in this district was, even at the time of Settlement, comparatively speaking very small.

6. In regard to the question of partitions of the chief headmen's holdings, the orders of the Financial Commissioner, communicated in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the letter above referred to, seem to amount to this, that we must presume that the consent of the land-holders of the estate was given to the making over of a portion of the common land to the chief headman to cultivate in return for his services in that capacity. If so, he must presumably be treated as a tenant of the plot so made over to him, holding under the whole body of land-holders of the village, and not as a co-sharer breaking up part of the common land, inasmuch as he holds land subject to the payment of rent. As a tenant he would be entitled to protection under Act XVI of 1887 and could not be ejected except under the provisions of that Act. This introduces a further element of difficulty in dealing with applications for partition of common land including the assignments of chief headmen. Moreover, these assignments were made in 1865, and, therefore, where a chief headman has been in continuous possession up to the present date, or for more than 20 years, he or his heirs would apparently be entitled to occupancy rights in the land so assigned under Section 5 (1) (*d*) of the Tenancy Act, for, as I have endeavoured to show above, he is apparently holding, not as a co-sharer, but as a tenant of the proprietary body, and paying rent either entirely by service or where, by a judicial decision, a *málikána*

has been awarded to the proprietors on account of the common land so held, partly by service and partly in cash. On the death of such an ala-lambardár it will apparently be impossible to make over possession of the land assigned to the headman appointed to succeed him, and the heirs of the first headman will unduly benefit in a way in which it was certainly never intended that they should so benefit, while the general proprietary body will have been deprived of a portion of their common land, for an occupancy tenant under such conditions will be practically an owner.

7. I shall shortly be called on to deal with such cases coming before me on appeal from the orders of the subordinate Revenue Officers, and before so dealing with them it would be of immense assistance to me and of possible advantage to Government if you would kindly favour me with your opinion as to the correctness, or otherwise, of the views herein tentatively put forward.

8. If they are correct, I would again, with all respect, strongly urge that the Gordian knot should be cut by resuming all these *máfis*, at any rate upon the death of the present holders, even if it is regarded as undesirable to resume them at once, on the ground that they were made without proper authority. Should this course not meet with approval, the only way out of the difficulty, and this at the best would prove but a temporary expedient, seems to be to disallow all claims for partition of ala-lambardárs' assignments under Section 115 of the Land Revenue Act. If the ownership is divided and the actual possession left undisturbed, the land-holders, to whose share the land of which the revenue was assigned falls, will certainly sue to eject the ala-lambardár, and the hands of Government will perhaps be fettered by inconvenient judicial decision declaring such ala-lambardárs to be occupancy tenants.

No. 3588, dated 18th June 1888.

From—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I AM now directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 292, dated 23rd April 1888, on the subject of the revenue-free assignments which were made to village chief headmen in the Gurdáspur District at the last Settlement.

2. The main point on which Mr. Dane asks for instructions in the letter which you forwarded for orders is as to the action to be taken in cases where land assigned under the Settlement arrangements has been carried away by the river. You remark on this point that the matter must depend on the decision arrived at with regard to the general question of continuing the assignments of land revenue to the village headmen; and in this remark the Financial Commissioner agrees. Pending the decision of the general question, the Settlement Officer should not hold out any hopes of new grants in lieu of land washed away by the river. This class of máfidár may well, the Financial Commissioner thinks, be content to accept what is the rule for other classes of assignees of Government revenue.

3. As to the general questions that arise in connection with the system of village chief headmen and their remuneration in the Gurdáspur District, I am to observe that in my predecessor's letter No. 6755, dated 3rd December 1887 (paragraph 2), it was intimated that the part of the case which concerned the abolition or retention of the *ála-lambardári* system should not be taken up in the present discussion. The rest of the case falls under two heads—(*i*) the question of the rights of the ála-lambardárs in the lands allotted to them at the Regular Settlement, and (*ii*) that of the assignments of land revenue.

4. The views of the Financial Commissioners as to the first of these questions were expressed in paragaphs 3–7 of the letter quoted just above. These views appear to Colonel Gordon Young to have been expressed with sufficient explicitness, and it does not seem possible to add anything, at least on the information so far spplied. It was indicated that the status of the ála-lambardár which regard to the land allotted to him must to some extent depend in each case on the terms of the agreement recorded in the Settlement record. The Officiating Financial Commissioner will be obliged if the Settlement Officer will report distinctly the nature of the entries made in the Settlement record of the terms on which the ála-lambardárs hold the lands. It is gathered that these entries are not the same in every case. The Settlement Officer should also report what has been decided by the Revenue Courts in the cases that have come before them so far (Mr. Dane's paragraph 7).

5. With regard to the question (*ii*) of land revenue assignments also, the Officiating Financial Commissioner thinks that the action to be taken must depend in a great measure on the terms actually recorded as to the tenure of these grants. What these terms are does not clearly appear from the correspondence,—whether the grants were made as a perpetual adjunct of the office of ála-lambardár or for the term of Settlement, or during the incumbency of the ála-lambardár of the time. In paragraph 6 of Mr. R. M. Dane's letter No. 162, dated 8th July 1887, it is stated that the assignments are "merely held during the pleasure of Government." But the Financial Commissioner wishes to have exact information on this point. It is possible that there may have been some diversity in the nature of the entries made, as a good deal of discretion in giving effect to the decision of Government seems to have been left to the Settlement Officer. I am accordingly to ask that the exact terms of the grants may be quoted according to the entries in the Settlement records or any special registers in which these assignments were entered. If the entries vary, the terms of specific representative cases should be quoted.

No. 789, dated 16th October 1888.

From—C. M. Rivaz, Esquire, Officiating Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division,

To—T. Gordon Walker, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

With reference to your No. 3588 of the 18th June last, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter from the Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur, No. 478 of the 26th ultimo, with its annexures in original, furnishing the further information called for by the Financial Commissioner in regard to the land revenue assignments which were made to village chief headmen in the Gurdáspur District at the last Settlement.

2. Mr. Dane's present report shows, I would urge more forcibly than ever, how desirable it is that these assignments should now be resumed, even if it be decided to continue the *ala-lambardári* system in this district in its present or in any modified form. It seems clear that Mr. Prinsep's arrangements were not sanctioned by any adequate authority, nor was any promise made by him that these grants should be a perpetual adjunct of the office of chief headman. No breach of faith will, therefore, be committed if advantage is taken of the district being under re-settlement to resume all these assignments and to restrict the remuneration of the chief headmen in future to the one per cent. of the land revenue, which is their ordinary allowance in other districts; while the advantage which will accrue both to Government and the village proprietary bodies by effecting such resumptions is obvious.

3. As regards the rights of the chief headmen in the lands assigned to them when the grants were made out of village common land, Mr. Dane describes how he has dealt with the question when coming before him in partition appeals. These appeals have lain to my court in cases instituted after the coming into force of the new Land Revenue Act, and my action in the matter has been much the same as Mr. Dane's. It is clear that the assignee has not acquired a proprietary title, nor even any right of permanent occupancy in any such land, Section 10 of the Tenancy Act being a bar to the acquisition of any occupancy status; so there is no valid ground for refusing partition of these assignments when claimed by the assignee's co-sharers. The assignee's position after partition is that he becomes a tenant of the person or persons to whose share the land in his cultivation is allotted, instead of being, as heretofore, a tenant, in respect of such land, of the whole proprietary body; and if such person or persons wish to eject him, they will have to proceed, as provided in the Tenancy Act, by notice or by suit. And in such cases the assignee will be liable to ejectment, subject to the receipt of any compensation for improvements to which he may be entitled, unless he can show that he is protected by an agreement within the meaning of Section 111. If the assignments in question are resumed, so far as the Government revenue is concerned, these chief headmen who have received cultivating grants of common land will not be able to fall back upon any agreement under Section 111 when their eviction is desired by the proprietor; and it seems but just that action should thus be taken to abrogate any such agreements as were entered in the record of rights at the last Settlement, as apparently such entries were made against the wish of the proprietary bodies concerned.

4. Lastly, Mr. Dane again urges that, as his Settlement is making rapid progress a speedy decision as to whether the chief *lambardári* system is to be retained in its present or in any modified form is very desirable. I presume that this question is being considered in connection with all the three districts in this Division—Gurdáspur, Amritsar and Lahore —which are at present under Settlement. For my own part, I should like to see the system abolished altogether as the present holders of these appointments die out. There can be no doubt, I think, that it has not been a success. No administrative advantage has been gained by having a chief headman in each village, while, on the other hand, the

creation of these appointments has, in most cases, been the cause of incessant dissensions and jealousies among the rival headmen. In any case, if the system is continued at all, it requires considerable modification in these three districts.

The present practice of having of necessity a chief headman in every village, however small it may be, even when it possesses only a single lambardár, is obviously absurd. If I recollect right, when the chief *lambardári* system was extended to the Rohtak District at its last Settlement, provision was made that chief headmen should only be appointed in villages paying a certain considerable amount of revenue and containing a certain number of headmen of the same tribe, and if the system is to be continued in Gurdáspur, Amritsar and Lahore, at least some such similar restrictions should now be imposed in these three districts also. Further, if it be decided to continue the chief *lambardári* system in some form or other, and at the same time to resume their revenue assignments in Gurdáspur, orders are required as to how their prescribed remuneration of one per cent. on the land revenue collections is to be provided in future in this district. Mr. Dane shows that at present this allowance is a deduction from the Government land revenue demand in the Shakargarh tahsíl, while in the other three tahsíls it is collected as a cess in addition to the land revenue, except in the Shahpur Kandi Taluka of Patháankot, where hitherto the chief headmen have received no remuneration at all.

Uniformity in this respect is desirable for the future, and there seems no reason why the chief headmen throughout the district, if they are maintained, should not receive their one per cent. remuneration out of the village officer's cess, as contemplated in paragraph 40 (2) of the Rules under the Land Revenue Act, Part II.

No. 478, dated 26th September 1888.

From—L. W. Dane, Esquire, Settlement Collector, Gurdáspur,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

In compliance with the directions contained in letter No. 3588 of 18th June last, from the Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, forwarded with your endorsement No. 419 of 19th idem, I have the honor to transmit specimen entries of the *Muntakhib* and *Darkhwást málguzári* prepared at the revision of Settlement showing the terms on which the grants were to be held by the chief headmen then appointed.

2. As far as I have been able to ascertain, four kinds of grants were made to these officers :—

(1) An assignment of the revenue on land owned by themselves in severalty or jointly with other proprietors.

(2) An assignment of the revenue on land owned by other proprietors in severalty.

(3) A grant of cultivated common land free of revenue.

(4) A grant of uncultivated *shámilát* free of revenue.

The first two kinds of grants are *máfis* or *zamindári ináms* pure and simple, and the chief headman can claim nothing more than the land revenue assigned to him.

3. Difficulties, however, occur in regard to the last two classes. All the grants are made during the pleasure of Government, in accordance with the entries in the note-book. The general conditions are that the inámdár can cultivate the *máfi* land and no proprietor can prevent him from doing so. On the resumption of the *inám* he will have no right of cultivation. In some villages there is a condition to the effect that if he cultivates the land he must pay to the shareholders a *málikána* according to the rates prevailing in the village. It is expressly stated that on resumption, which entirely depends on the pleasure of Government, the chief headman's heirs have no claim to the grant. The wording differs, but the terms are practically the same. The entry in the *Lál kitáb* referred to is a mere statement that *A. B.* is appointed chief headman with an *inám* of so much out of the culturable or cultivated, as the case may be. Sometimes Mr. Prinsep recorded that there was no land available for an *inám*; sometimes he assigned the revenue on definite holdings; and sometimes again he states that the village is small and there is no necessity to grant any *inám*. Altogether he seems to have exercised a very wide discretion indeed.

In tahsíl Patháankot the chief headman is obliged by the terms of his grant in some cases to keep up two registers of marriages. This condition has not been fulfilled.

4. Since writing my last letter, I have obtained a copy of the printed Selections from the Records of the Financial Commissioner on the *ala-lambardári* system and a copy of letter No. 1005, dated 29th October 1864, from Secretary to Government, Punjab, to Financial Commissioner, and of No. 3684 of 3rd November 1864 from Financial Commissioner to Settlement Commissioner. The only sanction accorded to Mr. Prinsep's proposals appears to be that contained in Sir R. Montgomery's note forwarded with letter No. 1005 above quoted. His orders are to this effect :—one per cent. of the revenue of the

parganah—in some special cases it might be more—to be set apart for the payment of the head lmabardár and for *ináms ;* one-tenth of the proceeds of jungle or uncultivated waste lands to be distributed to the head lambardárs ; also one-tenth of all land brought under cultivation during the period of Settlement by his exertions. The head lambardár should be exempted from the payment of *pachotra* of lands belonging to himself.

5. A reference to the specimen entries will show that Mr. Prinsep did not carry out these instructions. In all one per cent. of the revenue was to be set apart but in addition to these grants, the annual value of which exceeds one per cent. on the revenue, the chief headmen in this district enjoy one per cent. on the revenue as *pachotra.*

In Shakargarh, where Mr. Prinsep allowed his fancy the freest scope, these officers hold 7,046 acres of land assessed at Rs. 8,718, and in addition receive *pachotra* amounting to Rs. 2,967 at one per cent. on the revenue of the tahsíl. This *pachotra* is deducted from the Government revenue and is not a cess in addition to it, as in the case of the other tahsíls.

The figures for the other tahsíls and the whole district for the year 1886 are given below:—

	Area.	*Jama.*	*Pachotra.*
		Rs.	Rs.
Gurdáspur	2,704	3,567	3,889
Batála	2,788	3,685	3,775
Shakargarh	7,046	8,718	2,967
Pathánkot	827	1,428	849
	13,363	17,398	11,480

6. In the Shahpur Kandi Circle of the Pathánkot tahsíl the ala-lambardárs do not receive any *pachotra,* and no assignments have yet been made in their favour. This is because this tract was transferred from the Kángra district and was not assessed by Mr. Prinsep. Ala-lambardárs were, however, appointed by Mr. Roe in 1872 in villages where there is more than one headmen, and up to the present discharge similar duties, or at any rate hold the same position, as chief headmen in other parts of the district without receiving any remuneration other than their ordinary *pachotra* as headmen.

7. Are chief headmen to be appointed in every village in Shahpur Kandi, and should these chief headmen now be given *ináms* and extra *pachotra,* and should the Shakargarh *pachotra* remain as a deduction from the Government revenue, or be converted into a cess on, and in addition to, the revenue ? These are questions which also present themselves for determination. I can only hope that the example set by Mr. Roe may be followed, and that, as proposed by my predecessor in paragraph 10 of his No. 162 of 8th July 1887, the office be restricted to large villages in which there are several headmen. The amount of revenue and number of headmen entitling a village to the dignity might perhaps be reduced to Rs. 1,000 per annum and three headmen respectively. Mr. Prinsep did not even carry out his own proposals and entirely stultified his own scheme by appointing sole lambardárs to be chief headmen, or, as he has done in some instances, two headmen in one village. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that he apparently did not give effect to the orders he received, and in consideration also of the great diversity of system in this respect which prevails throughout the district, I trust that this opportunity may be taken to definitely lay down the principles on which the *ála-lambardári* system in this district is to rest for the future, and the absurd anomaly done away with as soon as possible of having two chief headmen in one village, or a sole lambardár appointed as ála-lambardár also. In this respect I cannot add anything to my predecessor's letter above referred to, and in consequence of the orders contained in paragraph 3 of the Financial Commissioner's letter under reply I am precluded from entering further into the question.

8. As regards the question of the rights of the chief headmen in the lands they hold where a grant of *shámilát* was made to them, I have had careful search made, and append a translation of two vernacular proceedings of Commissioner, Amritsar, dated 26th December 1866, and 5th February 1867, and an abstract of certain decisions passed on the point by Revenue Officers and Civil Courts since 1865. The first thing that strikes one is how bitterly the people were opposed, especially in tahsíl Shakargarh, to these grants being made. Before the Settlement operations were concluded even, they protested against the alienation of their lands and were not deterred entirely by the order passed by Settlement Commissioner on 14th September 1864, that they should be fined for petitioning and warned against interfering with the policy of Government in future. Correspondence resulting in the issue of the vernacular proceedings mentioned above ensued, and the confident anticipations expressed by Mr. Prinsep that the people would gladly acquiesce in the grant of common lands were entirely falsified by the actual facts.

9. The decisions quoted go to show that, as a rule, the courts followed the conditions of the grants recorded in the *Darkhwást málguzári* or *Ikrárnáma málikána* and laid down in the vernacular procedings of the Commissioner, Amritsar, dated 26th December

1866 and 5th February 1867. Though from the report of Shib Diál, Superintendent, dated 3rd September 1864, in case 1 of Mauza Bua it is clear that in almost every village the strongest objections were raised to this system of allotments to the chief headmen, they upheld the possession of the chief headman in uncultivated waste broken up by him, and sometimes in cultivated *shámilát* also, subject to the payment of *málikána* to the co-sharers wherever they demanded it. Sometimes they awarded a share of the produce, and sometimes a cash *málikána*. Case 14 is curious, as showing that the arbitrators appointed by the parties upheld the possession of the heirs of the late chief lambardár on the ground that he had cleared and improved the land. This decision is contrary to the general conditions of the grants. In case 19 the Extra Assistant Commissioner dismissed the claim of the sharers for entry, on the ground that the chief headman had been in possession for more than 12 years. His law was probably wrong, and the decision should not be allowed to affect the merits of the case. With the exception of this decision, we nowhere find that the courts have awarded proprietary or occupancy rights to these village officers. They have upheld their possession, subject to the payment of rent for as long as Government chooses to maintain these grants, and that is all.

10. The grants were all made "during the pleasure of Government" and are recorded in the register of grants held subject to this condition. They have served no useful purpose whatever, and should, I submit, be resumed now that the settlement at which they were assigned by an officer apparently acting in excess of the powers conferred upon him has expired. Government will benefit to the extent of some Rs. 20,000 or more a year, while the people will recover the land which has been appropriated to the private use of the chief headman for so long, and which they are so anxious to obtain, especially in Shakargarh, where, owing to extreme sub division, the holdings are very minute.

11. I may perhaps state shortly the principles on which I have dealt with appeals in partition cases coming before me, as required in paragraph 4 of Financial Commissioner's letter under reply. Instructions were issued on receipt of the first orders, that where there was no judicial decision conferring an adverse title on the ála-lambardár, or any condition to the contrary in the Settlement record, and the majority of the proprietors desired it, the *máfi* should be divided.

Appeals in cases instituted before the new Revenue Act came into force have come before me, and in dealing with these I have followed the principles quoted above. The directions of the Financial Commissioners, contained in paragraph 7 of No. 6755 of 3rd December 1887, to the effect that, as occupant of the common land, the chief headman is tenant of the land owners, and the general tenor of the decisions given in the appendix, compelled me, however, to deal with his possession under the provisions of the Tenancy Act. As a tenant he can only be ejected in pursuance of a definite procedure laid down in the Act. I have, therefore, while dividing the proprietary right, upheld his possession, leaving it to the sharers into whose holdings the parcels of land held by him may fall, to deal with him under the Act. In this way it has been unnecessary for me to enter into the question of what compensation for disturbance he may be entitled to, or what his other rights are, as these can be settled when an application or suit to eject him is brought. I have not regarded him as an ordinary jágirdár, and as such entitled under certain circumstances to a right of occupancy under Section 5 (1) (*d*) of Act XVI of 1887, and to have his holding excluded from partition under Section 112 (3), Act XVII of 1887, inasmuch as the grants were made on special conditions (recorded in the Settlement records in most cases or arguable from an analogy of similar cases), and under those conditions the right to possess the land ceased on the inámdár ceasing to hold that status. Still in every case practically the chief headman was an assignee of land revenue, as the culturable waste was taken into consideration at the time of settlement, though the revenue assessable thereon was generally distributed over the cultivated area.

12. The whole question of the right of the chief headman is, as will be seen from the foregoing remarks, wrapped in obscurity, which is rendered more dense by the fact that, beyond the brief and apparently self-contradictory entries in the note-books, Mr. Prinsep has left no record of his proceedings and the principles by which he was guided, or the authority on which he acted in making the grants.

Additional difficulty is caused under the provisions of Act XVII of 1887 as to the course of appeal in partition cases. The ala-lambardár, in objecting, does not state that he claims the ownership of the grant or a right of occupancy in the land held by him. He simply protests against the land being included in the partition with a view of keeping the question of title out of the regular Civil or Revenue Courts. I have treated his objections, as made in regard to the property to be included in the partition, and, as such, the appeal lies under Section 118 to the Commissioner. At the same time, if he chose to claim rights of ownership or occupancy, the appeal would lie either to the Divisional Court or Chief Court, or to me as Collector. This will always be a difficult point in partition cases where the grounds of objection to the partition are commonly of a mixed character, some being made on the score of title and others to the inclusion of certain lands in the partition.

13. In conclusion, I can only say that I have done my best to make the position of these grants clear, but the task is almost impossible, bearing in mind the peculiar way in which they were made. This, however, can be stated with confidence, that, if they are now

resumed, everyone concerned, with the exception of the actual holders, will largely benefit—from Government, which will receive a considerable increase to its revenues, down to the people, who will recover their share of the common land, out of which they have been kept so long, and the courts or officers, who will not be compelled to try and discover order and precedent out of a chaotic tangle of conflicting decisions and legal principles. At any rate it is desirable that final orders on the subject should issue with as little delay as possible, so that the necessary action can be taken to resume the grants and strike them off the registers before the new assessments are brought out. Mutations of such *máfis* are only being made at present on the express condition that the assignee can raise no objection to the resumption of the grant should Government see fit to do so.

Rúbkár on Revenue side, Gurdáspur District, Major R. YOUNG, Deputy Commissioner, presiding, 26th December 1866.

LETTER No. 252, dated 15th December 1866, from Commissioner, with letter No. 720, dated 27th November 1866, from Settlement Commissioner, has been received in this office, to the effect that in many villages the Government right in the *banjar* has been assigned to the ala-lambardárs, but the rights of the owners have not been given to them. If the land is *shámilát*, then the ownership is *shámilát* ; but if the share (assigned) is small, it is certain that the biswadárs will not ask for *málikána*. If they do, they are entitled to it. It is hoped that, when they know that their rights have been maintained, they will not bring claims to assert their rights. As to right of cultivation, if the ala-lambardár himself breaks up and cultivates the land, he has the same rights as other biswadárs who may break up and cultivate *shámilát* land. One copy of this *rúbkár* to be sent to each of the four Tahsíldárs after entry in the receipt register, with instructions that they should decide their cases in accordance with these directions and, as far as possible, follow the orders of the Commissioner.

Rúbkár on Revenue side, Court of the Commissioner, Amritsar, Mr. PHILIP EGERTON presiding, dated 5th February 1867.

BEFORE this English correspondence has taken place between this office and the three Deputy Commissioners under it on the subject of the rights of the ála-lambardárs in the land of the *ináms*. It is certain that the officers referred to have sent translations of this to the Hindustáni Extra Assistants and Tahsíldárs ; still, for greater certainty, an abstract of the correspondence referred to is sent for circulation to the above-mentioned Extra Assistant Commissioners and Tahsíldárs.

First, in making the arrangements for *ináms* to the chief headmen, only the Government right was given to them. The *shámilát* land will remain *shámilát*, and is the property of the whole of the land owners. If the land owners of their own free will remit the *málikána* to the chief headmen, they may do so. If they do not do so, they can recover this.

Second, where, owing to there being no *banjar shámilát*, in special cases cultivated land has been given as an *inám* to the ála-lambardár, he has no right to eject the tenant.

Third, where *banjar* has been assigned as the *inám* and the ala-lambardár has broken it up, he or his tenant has the right to cultivate.

Fourth, in regard to the amount of *málikána*, when no rate was fixed at the time of Settlement, the land owners can file a suit and have *málikána* determined in accordance with the custom prevailing in the village. Still, where lands have been broken up, the ala-lambardár is entitled to consideration in the same way as other cultivators.

One copy of this to be sent to Deputy Commissioners, Amritsar, Gurdáspur, and Siálkot, with instructions to send a copy to Native Extra Assistant Commissioners and Tahsíldárs for guidance.

Note by W. M. YOUNG, Esquire, Second Financial Commissioner, Punjab, on the ala-lambardárs of the Lahore, Amritsar, Gurdáspur, Siálkot, Gujránwála and Gujrát Districts,—dated 23rd August 1889.

THE history of the appointment and remuneration of ala-lambardárs in Mr. E. Prinsep's Settlements, and of the extension of the system to other districts, is given in a précis which is appended to this note.

2. The matters which have been referred in the correspondence ending with the letter from the Commissioner of Lahore, No. 789, dated 16th October 1888, require the orders of Government. The districts concerned are those of Lahore, Amritsar, Gurdáspur, Siálkot, Gujránwála and Gujrát. These matters may be classed under two headings—

I.—The working of the system.

II.—The method of remuneration.

3. In regard to (I), the following proposals have been made :—

By Major Montgomery, Deputy Commissioner of Siálkot.—That the appointment be gradually abolished in Siálkot; that all existing holders of the post should continue to

enjoy their rights for life, subject to some modifications ; and that as vacancies occur they should not be filled up, but a certain number of ináudárs substituted.

By Mr. L. W. Dane, Settlement Officer, Gurdáspur.—That the appointment be gradually abolished in Gurdáspur, or that it be restricted to the case of large villages paying revenue not less than Rs. 2,000 and having five or more headmen. Further, that, if the appointment of chief headman be entirely abolished, a certain number of *ináms* be created in the district.

By Mr. C. M. Rivaz, Commissioner of Lahore.—That the system be abolished altogether as present holders die out.

4. It will be remembered that in the correspondence ending with Punjab Government No. 1947, dated 2nd December 1874, to Secretary to Financial Commissioner, opinions from officers serving in the old Lahore, Amritsar and Mooltan Divisions were recorded, differing widely as to the advantages of the system. Sir Henry Davies did not pronounce upon these conflicting opinions, but the system was extended to Rohtak, and subsequently (Punjab Government No. 154, dated 16th February 1877) to Delhi, Gurgáon and Karnál. For Mooltan (Punjab Government No. 854, dated 20th March 1876) the system of *zamindári ináms* was preferred, and the correspondence marginally noted shows the same tendency to prefer the *inám* system.

Correspondence ending with Punjab Government No. 980, dated 9th September 1881.
Correspondence ending with Punjab Government No. 192, dated 4th August 1882.
Correspondence ending with Punjab Government No. 360, dated 12th July 1884.

5. In December 1887 the late Colonel Wace, writing to the Commissioner of Lahore, stated that he was not prepared to give any immediate orders in respect of the reduction or continuance of the office of chief headman. The case, he said, was under separate consideration ; it must be decided after a careful and deliberate weighing of the merits of the question ; and it would be matter for regret if the reduction of an office of some emolument were too directly connected with the re-assessment operations now in progress. Latterly, Colonel Wace had intended to go into the whole question. I should have preferred to leave it for the present, but the assessment operations in the districts where Mr. Prinsep's arrangements for the appointment and remuneration of ala-lambardárs were carried out make it essential that the consideration of the question should not be postponed.

6. I consider it out of the question that such a sweeping measure as the abolition of the system should be taken in these six districts during the present operations. There are chief headmen in almost all of the villages ; in some there are two. However unpopular the system may be, or however useless in the majority of cases, such a measure would certainly be regarded as one of resumption, unless the loss of the position and emoluments were compensated by the bestowal of *ináms* and recognition of some corresponding status ; and this is quite out of the question, because of the number of the chief headmen and the unfitness of many of them. Nor am I prepared to say that its total abolition would be in itself desirable. It would be necessary to get further opinions before a judgment could be formed. But, as I do not suggest such a measure, I do not think it will be necessary to make further general enquiries in regard to the working of the system.

7. What I propose is to lay down, with the approval of Government, certain instructions in regard to the working of the system which seem necessary to correct abuses and give the officers in charge of re-assessment operations the guidance they need :—

I.—First, I would cancel, as regards the future Financial Commissioner's Book Circular No. XIX of 1874, ruling that no exception shall be made in the case of villages represented by a single lambardár, but that chief lambardárs should be appointed in such villages, provided authority for making the appointment has been given and a scale of remuneration fixed.

II.—As vacancies occur in such posts, they should not be filled up.

III.—Where there are only two headmen I would adopt the same procedure.

IV.—Where there are two or more chief headmen in one village, the opportunity of a vacancy should be taken to reduce the number to one.

8. My reasons for the above are—

(1). The original plan was to have one ala-lambardár where there were three or more lambardárs (*vide* Mr. E. Prinsep's Memo. No. 34, dated 1st January 1866 ; Sir R. Montgomery's Memo. on the subject, paragraph 2, contemplates " other lambardárs " inferior to the ala-lambardár). From the correspondence connected with Financial Commissioner's Book Circular No. XIX of 1874, it appears that Mr. E. Prinsep in 1871 gave orders to Settlement Officers to make appointments even where there was only one lambardar, on the ground that the duties of head lambardár would devolve upon such a lambardár equally with head lambardárs in other cases. A number of such appointments were accordingly made. The matter was referred by Colonel R. Young, Commissioner

of Lahore, and Mr. Egerton at first ruled that no ala-lambardár should be appointed unless there were two or more lambardárs in the village. Again, the matter was referred from Rohtak by Mr. Purser, who took Mr. Prinsep's view. Major Davies, Officiating Settlement Commissioner, held that single lambardárs should not be made head lambardárs, and that, where such appointments had been made, they should be reduced as vacancies occurred, but Mr. Egerton noted as follows : "I think it was evidently intended to give one lambardár an allowance of 6 per cent. in every village. . . . . No change should be made in arrangements already completed, and where ala-lambardárs are appointed to follow the same plan." Hence Book Circular XIX of 1874 was issued. I think the Financial Commissioner's decision was probably due in great measure to the fact that he did not wish to change the system as initiated without practical reasons, and that the question of remuneration was the matter for decision. But the original intention was clearly different, and considerable experience has now been gained, and in the districts now under settlement an opportunity is presented of reverting to the first intention.

(2). The principle laid down by Government in the Rohtak case (Government No. 1947, dated 2nd December 1874) was that a chief headman was only to be appointed where there were three or more lambardárs of the same *gôt* or clan, and even then a discretion was left. This system was followed in Karnál. In Delhi and Gurgáon it appears from the Settlement Reports that a minimum of three headmen was considered necessary to the appointment.

(3). Rule II, 38 (*a*), under the Punjab Land Revenue Act, pre-supposes "headmen" for such appointment.

9. It will take many years to give effect to the above proposals. When, however, the reduction contemplated in them shall have taken place, I think the way will become more clear to convert the remaining chief lambardárs into inámdárs, and gradually abolish the system if such a measure is thought advisable. I am not at present prepared to make specific recommendations about inámdárs or zaildárs; but if His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor will sanction the preliminary measures I have proposed, and indicate whether he would wish the question of gradually substituting inámdárs for ala-lambardárs in these six districts discussed after further inquiry as to the working of the system, this will clear the ground for further proposals. Personally, I am inclined to think that the opportunity should be taken at the present settlements to elaborate a plan for gradually substituting inámdárs for ala-lambardárs, but this can only be done with the fullest consideration for all existing incumbents who neither in regard to position nor emoluments ought to suffer by the present operations.

10. I now come (II) to the questions connected with the methods of remuneration of chief headmen raised in the correspondence.

Amritsar, Lahore, Gurdáspur, | Siálkot, Gujránwála, Gujrát.

11. The authority for the remuneration of the existing chief headmen in the districts marginally noted will be found in Sir R. Montgomery's Memo. The passage is as follows :—

"This head lambardár to be elected.

"The *pachotra* to go to the inferior lambardárs. It may be a question whether a portion of it should not also go to the head lambardár.

"One per cent. of the revenue of the pargana, in some special cases it might be more, to be set apart for the payment of head lambardárs and for ináms. One-tenth of the proceeds of jungle or uncultivated waste lands to be distributed to the head lambardárs. Also one-tenth of the proceeds of all land brought under cultivation during the period of settlement by his exertions.

"The head lambardár should be exempted from the payment of *pachotra* of land belonging to himself.

"If the village community preparing the *Wájib-ul-arz* agree to allow the head lambardár any perquisite on the registry of betrothals or marriages or births, I see no objection to the same.

"The object is to elevate the head lambardár to be a substantial and responsible agent and to secure him a good position."

12. In sending on the orders to the Settlement Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner (Sir D. Macleod) said : "It will, I presume, be expedient in all cases to leave with this individual such share of the *pachotra* as he may heretofore have enjoyed, but on this point you can exercise your own discretion and act according to circumstances."

13. Acting upon these instructions, Mr. Prinsep thus described the emoluments in his paper No. 34:—

"For these duties he receives ordinarily—

"(*a*) One per cent. on the *jama* of his village in excess of his own *pachotra.*

"(*b*) A portion of land or *inám*, whenever it can be given, equal to one-tenth of the culturable, and this has been allotted at settlement.

"(*c*) He is expected to register betrothals and marriages, for which he must keep a book at the *hutti* or shop; and if parties take advantage of this registration, he is entitled for the service so rendered to demand one rupee as fee for each betrothal and marriage so registered."

14. Thus it will be seen that Mr. Prinsep allowed the ala-lambardárs to keep their own *pachotra, i. e.*, the *pachotra* on revenue collected by them as lambardárs, in addition to the one per cent. on the *jama* of the village, and this was in accordance with the discretion left to him. Head (*b*) is vague, and we have to look to the reports now received to find out how it was carried into effect.

15. Mr. Dane says: "As far as I have been able to ascertain, four kinds of grants were made to these officers:—

"(1). An assignment of the revenue on land owned by themselves in severalty or jointly with other proprietors.

"(2). An assignment of the revenue on land owned by other proprietors in severalty.

"(3). A grant of cultivated common land free of revenue.

"(4). A grant of uncultivated *shámilát* free of revenue."

16. It was no doubt intended that Mr. Prinsep should report how he had given effect to the orders of Sir R. Montgomery, but there is no reason to suppose that if he had done so his arrangements would not have been sanctioned.

17. Mr. Dane and Mr. Rivaz strongly recommend that these grants should be resumed. The grounds for this recommendation appear to be—(1) that so far as they comprised rights other than that of receiving the Government revenue they were illegal; (2) that they were made without due authorization; (3) that they give rise to litigation and confusion; that they are unnecessary, and it is argued that, as they were made during pleasure of Government in connection with settlement arrangements, they are now fairly resumable. The late Colonel Wace has dealt with (1) in the letter from this office, No. 6755, dated 3rd December 1887. In regard to (2) there is no doubt that some of Mr. Prinsep's assignments exceeded the instruction he had received, but I cannot recommend that any part of his action in regard to such assignments should after this lapse of time be repudiated. Where he granted assignments of revenue on land owned by the ála-lambardárs or by other proprietors, it was because there was no possibility of effecting a grant from the *shámilát*, and the resumption of such assignments would merely introduce irregularities. The third objection is true, but the position is clear, *viz.*, that Government has only assigned what was its own, and that the enjoyment of other privileges, such as cultivating occupancy or proprietary right in the grant from the village waste, depends upon the intention of the proprietors at the time and upon facts which have since occurred, and the settlement of disputes on such matters rests with the courts. I think the difficulties which have arisen in connection with such matters do not require any special interference on the part of Government. Lastly, I cannot think that the grants should be regarded as made for the term of settlement, unless the office of ála-lambardár can be so regarded. Of this there is no evidence. I think the grants must be held to have been made by Mr. Prinsep as permanent appendages to the office of ála-lambardár so long as it should last, and that it was never intended to put into exercise the power implied in the term "during pleasure of Government," so as to deprive any existing holder of his privilege.

18. For these reasons I do not recommend any general resumption of the grants, but resumption would follow as a natural consequence of the abolition of the office in the cases in which such abolition has been recommended in the previous portion of this note. A separate report will have to be furnished for each of the six districts showing the extent and number of the assignments. If in any case the assignment is excessive, the circumstances should be specified, and separate orders passed. Subject to this proviso it will be desirable, when the reports have been received, for Government to confirm the existing grants to present occupants and to lay down rules for their future treatment. The Settlement Officer will be called upon to submit proposals to this effect. If the office of chief headman is gradually abolished the grants will *pari pasu* be resumed.

19. It only remains to deal with the other items of remuneration enjoyed by the chief headmen. I am not quite clear what Mr. Dane means by "one per cent. on the revenue as *pachotra*" in paragraph 5 of his No. 478, dated 26th September 1888. He says that in Tahsíl Shakargarh "this *pachotra* is deducted from the Government revenue and is

not a cess in addition to it as in the case of the other tahsils." I have shown above that the ála-lambardárs were to enjoy one per cent. on the revenue and such *pachotra* as they might be entitled to receive in their capacity of lambardárs. I consider that the one per cent. should at the present re-assessment be granted in every case as an *inám* out of the Government revenue, and that the chief headman should continue to receive his share of the *pachotra* from the village officers' cess, and that no other percentage should be maintained. The one per cent. would be available so long as chief headmen exist for their remuneration, and, wherever this office is abolished, for *zamindári ináms* if required.

20. In Shahpur Kandi I would appoint no more ála-lambardárs than have already been appointed, but provision for the one per cent. *inám* for those appointed should be made in this tract precisely similar to that obtaining in the rest of the district.

Précis of previous correspondence regarding the office of chief headman.

The appointment of *sarpanches* was apparently first suggested by Mr. Prinsep in his Revenue Report for 1861, but the passage is not given in the selections annexed to the Provincial Report of that year.

He submitted formal proposals in his No. 198, dated 12th August 1862, and after some discussion, in which the proposal was opposed by Mr. Melvill and upheld by Mr. Brandreth, the orders of Government were given sanctioning the introduction of the system (Punjab Government No. 1005 of 29th October 1865). Sir Robert Montgomery agreed to the appointment of a head lambardár without restricting the appointment expressly to cases in which villages were large. Remuneration was fixed as follows: "One per cent. of the revenue of the pargana (in some special cases it might be more) to be set apart for the payment of head lambardárs and for *ináms*, one-tenth of the proceeds of jungle or uncultivated waste lands to be distributed to the head lambardárs, also one-tenth of the proceeds of all land brought into cultivation during the period of Settlement by his exertions. The head lambardár should be exempted from the payment of *pachotra* on land belonging to himself. It may be a question whether a portion of the *pachotra* should not also go to the head lambardár."

The Financial Commissioner forwarded this to the Settlement Commissioner as "conveying the sanction of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor to the nomination and remuneration of head lambardárs in the mode therein prescribed where you may find it practicable and advisable to adopt this arrangement." Accordingly the Settlement Commissioner, in issuing a circular to guide his Assistants in the Amritsar Division, indicated (1) that the headman (by which he means *sarpanch* or chief headman) should be taken from the three or more existing lambardárs, and (2) that his remuneration should be (*a*) one per cent. on the *jama* (it is not stated whether this is a cess or a drawback), (*b*) a portion of land or (as) *inám* equal to one-tenth of the culturable area, and (*c*) fees for registering betrothals and marriages.

In consequence of the absence of Settlement Reports it is a little difficult to say how far these provisions were carried out in the Amritsar Division. It appears from the Gazetteers that in Gurdáspur (Settlement finished in 1865) there is a head lambardár "in almost every village" (Gurdáspur Gazetteer, page 44); "in Amritsar (Settlement finished 1866) there is a chief headman in every village" (Amritsar Gazetteer, page 30); and in Siálkot (Settlement also finished in 1866) there are chief headmen in all the villages where there are more than one headman, and they receive one per cent. on the land revenue of the village, and all enjoy small revenue-free grants called *ináms* out of the common village lands (Siálkot Gazetteer, page 51). In Gurdáspur neither the Lieutenant-Governor's nor the Settlement Commissioner's instructions seem to have been closely followed (see paragraph 7 of Mr. R. M. Dane's No. 162 of 8th July 1887), and in Siálkot Mr. Prinsep's orders at any rate appear to have been a dead-letter (see Major Montgomery's No. 356 of 31st August 1888). On the whole it would appear that the orders which it was intended to carry out in this Division when the system was started were those contained in Sir R. Montgomery's memo.

In Lahore, however, where the system was introduced at the end of 1866, the case was different (Settlement Report, paragraphs 253, 256 and 258). Here "out of the lambardárs of the village" one man was selected as head lambardár, and secured a remuneration of one per cent. besides *pachotra;* and "in addition to this a parcel of land will be assigned to him." Similarly in Gujránwála (Settlement completed 1867) "in each village a *sarpanch* or lambardár was elected from the existing lambardárs," and in some villages a *sarpanch* was elected for the Hindu and one for the Muhammadan element. Colonel Nisbet adds: "For particulars showing the status, duties and remuneration of . . . village headmen, Settlement Commissioner's Circular No. 34 of 1st January 1866 should be referred to" (Settlement Report, page 48); so that the system was probably based on that Circular. This seems to have been the case too in Gujrát (Settlement completed 1868), where chief headmen were made in villages where there were more than one lambardár and got a grant of 2 acres cultivated or 3 acres culturable for every 100 acres cultivated in the village, and occasionally there were two ála-lambardárs in a village (Settlement

Report, paragraph 424). It was ruled in Financial Commissioner's No. 5152, dated 19th October 1868, to Commissioner, Amritsar, that "ordinarily there should be only one lambardár *ála* or chief lambardár in each village."

Settlement Report, page 215.

In 1872 the system was introduced into Montgomery. Mr. Purser wrote at page 215 of the Settlement Report: "In all villages with more than one lambardár a head lambardár has been appointed. As head lambardár he will get one per cent. on the revenue of the village." This is an addition, not a drawback (Gazetteer, page 83). And chief headmen were appointed at the same time in Muktsar and Mamdot on an "extra cess" of one per cent. (Gazetteer, pages 60, 61; Mamdot Assessment Report, paragraph 43; Muktsar Assessment Report, paragraph 70). And when the Una tahsíl and Shahpur Kandi were settled in 1869—1873 chief headmen were appointed (*see* Punjab Government No. 192, dated 4th August 1882, as regards Una), but as the assessment was not revised no provision was made for their remuneration. In Shahpur Kandi the appointments are said to have been "in accordance with the system introduced by Mr. Prinsep and approved by Government" (Settlement Report, paragraph 31), and doubtless they were made on the same principles as in Gurdáspur.

Circular XIX of 9th October 1874 allowed ála-lambardárs to be appointed in *every* village "in districts where the appointment of chief lambardárs has been sanctioned by Government."

Page 497 of Selections.

The system was extended to Rohtak by Government's No. 1947 of 2nd December 1874. That letter allows the introduction of chief headmen in villages where there are three or more lambardárs, of the same *gôt* or clan (discretion being allowed to abstain even in these cases), and orders that the remuneration be made by deduction from the revenue demand (Settlement Report, paragraph 118). By a later letter (Punjab Government No. 64 of 8th May 1879) permission was given to extend the system to all villages with three or more headmen without regard to the number of clans in the village if the land owners desired it. The cess the Report says, was "first added to the revenue and then allowed on it again."

In Punjab Government No. 154 of 16th February 1877 the *ála-lambardári* system was introduced in Delhi, Gurgáon, and the part of Karnál then under settlement. The conditions are not minutely indicated in that letter, but the Settlement Reports give the following particulars. In Delhi chief headmen are appointed "only in villages where there are three or more headmen. The one per cent. allowed for their remuneration was . . . to be a deduction from the *jama* announced" (Settlement Report, paragraph 308). In Gurgáon "a chief headman has been appointed in every village having three or more headmen, except when for special reasons (such as that the village was uninhabited or the number of headmen was likely to be reduced to less than three) it was not thought expedient to make the appointment. The chief headman, like the zaildár, receives an allowance of one per cent. on the land revenue of his village including assigned land revenue which is deducted from the Government demand or revenue assignment before payment into the treasury or to the assignee" (Settlement Report, paragraph 313). And in the part of Karnál settled by Mr. Ibbetson "the rule was that a chief headman should be appointed only in such villages as had three headmen of the same caste and of the same *gens*" (Settlement Report, paragraph 653).

In the other parts of the Punjab, with one exception noted below, there are no ála-lambardárs.

In Pesháwar, except in the Hashtnagar and Yusafzai tahsíls, the system was introduced as it were by an accident, the Settlement Officer not being aware that Government would sanction *ináms* (Settlement Report, paragraph 568). The chief lambardárs get one per cent. on the revenue (Pesháwar Gazetteer, page 122).

It is during the period in which the great extension of the *ála-lambardári* system was initiated in the Delhi Division that we find the alternative principle, that of *ináms* to the class from whom chief headmen were appointed, beginning to assert itself in the western part of the Province. The *ináms* of Shahpur (settled 1854—1866) do not belong to this class (Settlement Report, paragraph 250). There are only between 50 and 60 of these, and the extension to them of Rules 28 and 29 of Part II of the new Land Revenue Rules, coupled with the fact that they have recently been (as a tentative measure) treated as involving duties similar to those of zaildárs (letter No. 3935, dated 4th July 1887, from Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, to Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division), shows clearly that the class these *ináms* apply to is that from which zaildárs are usually taken. But the treatment of the Hazára *ináms* (Settlement Report, pages 285—87) in the Settlement of that district (1868—1873), though not initiating any scheme intended to take the place of the *ála-lambardári* system, did in practice introduce a system of granting *ináms* to lambardárs of position. Instead of appointing ála-lambardárs, the old promiscuous *lambardári ináms* were partly disposed of by continuing them for life only, and partly utilized by controlling their succession by well-defined rules and confining them ordinarily to lambardárs of "special influence, distinction, or local responsibilities." There were, however, no zaildárs in Hazára, and the

inámdár to some extent took the place of the zaildár elsewhere, and this has been recognized by the extension of the *inámdári* rules to the Hazára district. In the Hashtnagar and Yusafzai tahsíls of Peshávar (Settlement Report, paragraphs 303—304), where there are no zaildárs or ála-lambardárs, the Khan's *ináms* (only 25 in number) are obviously not intended to provide for the class from which ala-lambardárs are taken, and no attempt seems to have been made to introduce an extra cess (or rather an extra *inám*) for head lambardárs (for the *pachotra* in Pesháwar is as far as possible in the form of an inám) in these two tahsíls as was done in the rest of the district. Settlement Report, page 258).

The *ináms* in the Dera Ismail Khan district (settled 1872—1879) were introduced for a variety of reasons (Settlement Report, Chapter V, paragraphs 656—664). The *sofed-poshi ináms* Cis-Indus, were granted to the extent of $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on the revenue "instead of raising the rate of *málikána*, which at the Summary Settlements had been fixed at a very low rate," and in Dera *ináms* are partly additions to the zaildárs' remuneration, intended to supplement the small income produced by the one per cent. allowance in the same way as was afterwards done in Jhang (Settlement Report, paragraph 238), Muzaffargarh (Settlement Report, page 104), and Sirsa and Fázilka (Settlement Report, paragraph 350), and partly ordinary *sofed-poshi ináms*. These latter were mainly intended to compensate lambardárs who had lost by the abolition of the *mushaksa* system, and it is only in a secondary way, and owing to the *ináms* being extended to other deserving lambardárs, that they can be said to take the place of the *ála-lambardári* system. In Tánk and Kuláchi, *ináms* were purposely introduced in lieu of the *zaildári* system wherever they did not prevail. The succession, &c., to these *ináms* are governed in Bhakkar, Leiah and Dera by rules like the Hazára Rules, and in Tánk by the Hazára Rules themselves.

There are small supplementary *ináms* to the *kotwáls* in Kángra (Gazetteer, page 130).

It is in Bannu (Settlement Report, paragraphs 216—219) that *ináms* were first introduced unmistakeably in the place of a system of chief headmen. During the Settlement (1872—1878) an attempt was made to introduce zaildárs and ála-lambardárs, but the experiment was abandoned in 1875 and a system of *ináms* introduced to meet the claims and employ the service of *both* classes of men,—those who would have been zaildárs and those who have been ála-lambardárs. The *ináms* are non-hereditary, conditional on service, and mostly conferred on village headmen. I think this may be said to be the first introduction of a system of *ináms* in lieu of a system of chief headmen.

Similarly, in Mooltan (settled 1873—1880) "the question of the introduction of the *ála-lambardári* system was under consideration for some time" (Settlement Report, paragraph 269), but by Punjab Government No. 354 of 20th March 1876 it was decided "that the system should not be introduced generally, but that in lieu of it *zamíndári ináms* should be conferred on such lambardárs as were likely from their position and character to be conspicuously useful. It was at first proposed to confine these grants to villages where there were several lambardárs, but it was eventually found better to look to personal character rather than to the accident of the number of lambardárs in a particular village." The Hazára Rules (except rule IV) were adopted, and the amount spent on these *ináms* is 0·26 per cent. of the revenue, or a little over the usual $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

The same course was not pursued in the Jhang and Muzaffargarh Settlements, where the *inám* was in addition to the *zaildári* cess; nor in Jhelum (1877—1880), where it was in place of it.

But the system of *ináms* in place of *ála-lambardári* was introduced in the Hoshiárpur and Jullundur Districts by Punjab Government No. 785 of 18th July 1881. And the system was adopted also in Ludhiána. The following extracts from the Settlement Reports explain its introduction :—

In Hoshiárpur "the appointment of chief headman having been abolished" [see also page 58 of Settlement Report; there is no notice of chief headmen having been previously appointed except in Una], "a certain number of life grants called *zamíndári* or *sofed-poshi ináms* have . . . . been allowed to deserving men who are not zaildárs." Una seems to be the only tract in the Punjab where the *ála-lambardári* system has been definitely superseded. The old ála-lambardárs there were given life *ináms*, and some *ináms* were given to other persons, chiefly lambardárs, on the terms mentioned in Settlement Commissioner's No. 130, dated 30th May 1882. In Jullundur (Settlement Report, page 175) "the system of giving small cash allowances—*sofed-poshi ináms*—to selected men, mostly lambardárs, who are not zaildárs, in order that they may *be* encouraged to use their influence in furthering measures of public utility and otherwise assist the district officials, has been introduced. The grants are usually from Rs. 25 to Rs. 40 per annum and are not to exceed $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the total revenue. They are not hereditary." In Ludhiána "it was at first proposed to appoint ála-lambardárs in the larger villages, but for this was substituted . . . a scheme for granting to selected lambardárs *ináms* to be deducted from the revenue. The total of these *ináms* was not to exceed $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. . . . . As far as possible the *ináms* were confined to villages with more than three lambardárs, as the

(Settlement Report, page 160).

Punjab Government No. 192, dated 4th August 1882.

object of the *ála-lambardári* system of which they were to take the place was the strengthening of the *lambardári* agency in large villages: but it was also desirable to distribute them over the district as much as possible, and the size of the villages varies a good deal in different parts, so that I found it necessary to give one or two in villages with less than four lambardárs. The *ináms* were of three classes, Rs. 20, Rs. 25 and Rs. 30 per annum, and averaged Rs. 25, which gave two to a zail" (Settlement Report, paragraph 329). Mr. Walker then proceeds to give the rules under which *ináms* are held.

In Ráwalpindi (Settlement Report, paragraph 137) there had previously been a system of *ináms* paid from patwári fees, but the new system of *ináms* introduced in the present Settlement (1880—1887) was regulated strictly with a view to correspondence with the *zaildári* and *ála-lambardári* prevalent elsewhere. The *ináms* were to amount to 1¼ per cent. on the revenue, 1 per cent. in lieu of *zaildári*, and ¼ per cent. in lieu of *ála-lambardári*. In Fatehjang and Attock, for special reasons, the rate was raised to 1½ and 2 per cent.

Government's letter No. 360 of 12th July 1884 sanctioned the introduction in Umballa (except the Morni *iláqua*) and in Karnál (except the portion previously settled and the estates included in the Siddhuwál and Arnauli *jágírs*) of a system of zaildárs, and apparently throughout the parts under settlement of *ináms* up to ¼ per cent. in place of ála-lambardárs.

These *ináms* were to be on similar conditions to those in the Hoshiárpur, Jullundur and Ludhiána Settlements.

There were zaildárs appointed in Muktsar and Mamdot in the Settlement of 1872 (Punjab Government No. 335, dated 7th March 1873; Muktsar Assessment Report, paragraph 70; Mamdot Assessment Report, paragraph 43); and the zaildárs in Fázilka got *ináms* in addition to their *zaildári* (Sirsa Settlement Report, page 503). Before the present settlement there were no legally constituted zaildárs in Moga, Zíra and the remainder of Ferozepore (Colonel Grey's appointments of 1882 being irregular), but they are now sanctioned by Punjab Government No. 67, dated 23rd February 1888. There are miscellaneous *ináms* in Moga and Zíra, but these are not of the nature of *sofed-poshi* or *zamindári ináms*. In addition to these existing grants, *ináms* up to ¼ per cent. are to be given in Moga, and, if necessary, up to ½ per cent. in Zíra—" as in the case of Moga, *ináms* up to ¼ per cent. on the land revenue may be recommended." (Assessment Report, Government Review, paragraph 7). In the part of the Ferozepore tahsíl under settlement *ináms* to the value of Rs. 352 were held " partly on account of services and partly as a relief to distressed village," but in addition to this " ¼ per cent. of the revenue of the tahsíl will be allowed in *inám*" (Assessment Report, paragraph 25; Government Review, paragraph 3). This ¼ per cent. is of course in lieu of the *ála-lambardári* system.

(Assessment Report, paragraph 75; Government Review, paragraph 8.)

In the above summary I have not considered the Kohát *ináms* as falling under the category of *ináms* in lieu of *ála-lambardári*. They are either (1) *lambardári ináms*, pure and simple, upheld for life, but intended for continuance, or (2) *ináms* to leading lambardárs and others for good service rendered.

(Settlement Report, paragraph 377).

We may, therefore, divide the Punjab into three tracts :—

(1). Where there are both zaildárs and ála-lambardárs, and no compensatory *ináms* are needed. This includes all districts where there are ála-lambardárs.

(2). Where there are zaildárs but no ála-lambardárs. In such tracts we may either have—

- (*a*) no compensatory *ináms*, as in Dera Ghází Khan and the Cis-Indus tahsíls of Dera Ismail Khan ;
- (*b*) *ináms* in lieu of *ála-lambardári*, as in Mooltan, Umballa, part of Karnál, Hoshiárpur, Ludhiána, Jullundur and Ferozepore ;
- (*c*) *ináms* to supplement *záildari*, as in Jhang, Muzaffargarh, Kángra, Sirsa, Fázilka and the Dera tahsíl of Dera Ismail Khan.

(3). Where there are neither zaildárs nor ála-lambardárs. In such tracts we may have—

- (*a*) *ináms*, really in lieu of *zaildári*, as in Shahpur, Jhelum, the Hashtnagar and Yusafzai tahsíls of Pesháwar and the Tánk and Kuláchi tahsíls of Dera Ismail Khan ;
- (*b*) no compensatory *ináms*, as in Hissár, Simla, Kulu, Kohát and (in a way) Hazára ;
- (*c*) *ináms* in lieu of both, as in Bannu and Ráwalpindi.

Roughly speaking, in 20 districts out of the 32 there are either ála-lambardárs (11¼ districts) or inámdárs who take their place (8⅔ districts).

No. 31, dated Lahore, 1st February 1890.

From—H. C. FANSHAWE, Esquire, Junior Secretary to Government, Punjab,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 824 of 28th November last, and in reply to convey the following orders of the Lieutenant-Governor upon the system of appointing and remunerating ála-lambardárs or chief headmen in force in the various districts which were settled under the supervision of Mr. Prinsep between 1862 and 1873.

2. The question is one of considerable local importance, and the Lieutenant-Governor has given his best consideration to it. The present reference deals with the cases of the Gurdáspur and Siálkot districts only, but it has been necessary to remember that the orders issued upon it will be presumably applicable to all the above districts. The facts of the case are clearly summarised by Mr. R. M. Dane in his letter No. 167 of 8th July 1887 and Mr. L. W. Dane in his letter No. 478 of 26th September 1888, and have been briefly set forth by the Financial Commissioner in his memo. of 23rd August last. Speaking generally, ála-lambardárs were appointed in all estates at last settlement and were remunerated by a double system of allowances,—first, an *ála-lambardári* cess of 1 per cent. on the land revenue of the village; and, secondly, a plot of land to be held as a *máfi*, that is, free of revenue. Such *máfi* plots were ordinarily allotted from the *shámilát* or land held in common by the village proprietors, and it was intended that the whole rents of the plot should be enjoyed by the ála-lambardár. Where no such land was available the revenue only of a particular plot of assessed land was assigned to the ála-lambardár as a *máfi*. It is now reported that in these two districts the system of appointment of ála-lambardárs has been found to be a useless expenditure of money in a large number of villages which have a single lambardár only, or not more than two lambardárs, and that in some others owing to peculiarities of tenure the selection of one headman as ála-lambardár causes an amount of trouble and heart-burning which nullifies the advantages of the system. It is, therefore, recommended that this should now be acknowledged, and that the system should be at all events confined to a certain number of villages. It is also reported that the assignment of common village lands for the part remuneration of ála-lambardárs was made practically without the consent of the other share holders, and that this has led to many complications and quarrels, and in some cases to suits in the Courts, and it is urged that at least this part of the plan of remuneration should be altered.

3. Sir James Lyall agrees with the local officers in considering that where the *máfis* were made in the shape of allotments of the village common land the action of Government at the previous settlement in putting the person for the time being selected to fill the office of ála-lambardár in exclusive possession of such allotment was probably *ultra vires*, and that from the date on which the new settlement takes effect the Government must disconnect itself from this arrangement and leave the persons in possession to settle any disputes which may arise as to their rights by private arrangement with the co-proprietors. If the Settlement Officers can in a friendly way induce the parties to such disputes to come to a fair agreement, it will be an advantage. And where the *máfis* are assignments of revenue on particular lands held in severalty by the ála-lambardárs or other persons, they are grants which are troublesome in form and calculated to complicate selection for appointments when vacancies occur in the post of chief headman. The Lieutenant-Governor is, therefore, pleased to direct that as regards all these *ála-lambardári máfis* the fields of which they are composed shall now be thrown into the *málguzári* area, and that cash *ináms* by way of drawbacks or refunds out of the revenue of the village shall be substituted to the value of the revenue which will now be imposed in the village internal rating on the said fields (or which would be impossible if the land was held in severalty), subject to the proviso that if the sum of such revenue exceeds 1 per cent. on the new assessment of the village it must be reduced to 1 per cent. These cash *ináms* will be enjoyed by the holders of the office, who will thus continue to receive an equivalent of all that it was really ever in the power of Government to assign to them.

4. But as regards the proposed abolition or partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system, His Honor is not prepared to pass orders at present. In

respect to villages having three or more lambardárs, he thinks the system is generally a useful one if properly worked, and that no sufficient reason for its abolition has been shown. As regards villages having only one or two lambardárs, and a few other villages in which peculiarities of tenure make the system inapplicable, he is prepared to consider the abolition of the system if the question is reported in the final Settlement Report of each district concerned. If in the orders on that report the system is abolished in such villages, the *ála-lambardári ináms* in such villages will lapse on the decrease of the persons then holding the office, and the *ála-lambardári* cess will merge in the *malba* or cess for village expenses. In their report on the subject, the Settlement Officers should give lists for each *zail* of the villages in which they recommend that the office should be abolished, and state the value of the *ála-lambardári ináms* which should lapse, and they may recommend that as lapses occur an equivalent sum should be devoted to providing *zamíndári ináms* for a limited number of selected lambardárs in each *zail* on the system which has been followed in recent settlements of districts where ála-lambardárs have not been appointed. These *ináms* would be given to selected headmen who from time to time may render really special service to the district administration, and would be held under the ordinary rules for such *ináms* contained in the rules under the Land Revenue Act. An account would have to be kept of the lapses of the *ála-lambardári ináms* in each *zail*, and against the amount of these the Deputy Commissioner would have from time to time to propose *zamíndári ináms* as above for the sanction of the Commissioner of the Division.

5. The *ála-lambardári* cess will continue to be levied as a cess in addition to the revenue, and where, as in the Shakargarh tahsíl, it forms at present a deduction from the revenue, this should now be changed. Under orders recently issued by Government, the *zaildári* cess of the districts at present under settlement will form a deduction from the revenue, and the land owners will be relieved of this charge. The orders in the case should be carefully explained to the people and the provisions by which all present incumbents will be allowed to retain the post of ála-lambardár in all cases, and existing village *máfis* will, in the interests of the villagers, be converted into cash allowances, should be made widely known. If this is done, the Lieutenant-Governor thinks that it will be recognized that Government is acting solely in the interests of the people and the administration in this matter, and that the action taken will not be subject to any unfair misrepresentation. Meanwhile, till orders are passed for each district on the final Settlement Report, all vacancies in the post of ála-lambardár may continue to be filled up as before.

6. The Lieutenant-Governor thinks that these orders may be of general application to all the districts which were settled under Mr. Prinsep's directions and in which chief headmen were appointed. It will be open, however, of course to any Settlement Officer to make any representation on any part of the subject which he may think should receive the further consideration and orders of Government.

Copy of a letter No. 190, dated 29th March 1890, from LOUIS W. DANE, Esquire, Settlement Collector, Gurdáspur, to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Circular No. 56 of the 21st current, forwarding for guidance, the orders of Government on the *ála-lambardári* system, and with reference to paragraph 6 of letter No. 31 of 1st February 1890, from Junior Secretary to Government, to bring the following minor points to notice for orders.

2. I presume that the commutation of the *máfis* held by these village officers into cash *ináms* out of the revenue of the village must be deferred until each tahsíl is assessed, as the amount of the *inám* is to be determined by the revenue assessed or assessable on the fields comprised in the *máfi* at the new assessment.

3. Where the land assigned to the chief headman has not been broken up by him up to the present, or has ceased to exist, he is not apparently entitled to any cash *inám*, and must be content with the proceeds of the *ála-lambardári* cess.

4. In Shahpur Kandi, as pointed out in paragraph 6 of my No. 478 of 26th September 1888, chief headmen have only been appointed in villages where there is more than one headman. I apprehend that it is not necessary to proceed to appoint them now where there is only a single headman.

5. In this tract also they receive no special remuneration; but Mr. Roe arranged in paragraph 31 of his printed Settlement Report, that the petty rent-free holdings or *sasaus* enjoyed by some of the headmen should be transferred to the chief headman on the death of existing incumbents. This has not been carried out always up to the present, and orders are now requested on the point. These *sasaus* should apparently now be treated as *ála-lambardári máfis* and commuted into cash *ináms*, for the benefit of the chief headman, where such an officer exists, with effect from the announcement of the now assessment, when also the *ála-lambardári* cess could be appropriately imposed.

6. I would also take this opportunity of pointing out that for some time past it has been the practice in this district to abstain from appointing a successor to a chief headman, on the office becoming vacant, in villages where there are less than three headmen and the revenue of the estate does not amount to Rs. 1,000. There are at present some 113 cases of this kind pending, in which the appointment of a chief headman has been held in suspense. It would considerably complicate matters if these posts were now to be filled up and two years hence recommendations made in the Final Report to abolish them. Moreover, by gradually reducing the offices as they fall vacant the risk of friction and popular discontent are very much diminished, and by the close of settlement operations a certain amount of reserve funds will have accumulated, out of which the Settlement Officers can propose *ináms* for the benefit of the leading agriculturists who have rendered conspicuous assistance during the course of the settlement. It will be hardly possible, or even desirable, for him to forestall the action of the Deputy Commissioner by nominating men to receive these *ináms*, if sanctioned by the orders on the Final Report, as a considerable interval must in that case elapse before the *ináms* will be available for grant.

7. Under the circumstances, therefore, I respectfully venture to suggest that where, with the sanction of the Commissioner and Financial Commissioner, as is the case in this district (*vide* your office No. 763, dated 13th September 1889), action has been taken as described in the foregoing paragraphs, sanction may be accorded to the steps taken and the Settlement Officer allowed to reduce the post of chief headman in villages having only one or two headmen, as they fall in, and similarly to abstain from appointing a successor in cases where there are more than one chief headman in the same village.

No. 262, dated 9th April 1890.

Commissioner's Office, Lahore Division.

COPY forwarded to J. M. Douie, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, for orders, with reference to his No. 1850 of the 20th ultimo (sub-head 71, File 5). Mr. Dane's questions all appear to Commissioner, after perusal of the correspondence, to call for reply in the affirmative.

No. 3119, dated 17th May 1890.

From—M. W. FENTON, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 262, dated 9th April, forwarding a letter in which the Settlement Officer of Gurdáspur makes certain inquiries as regards the effect of the orders contained in Punjab Government No. 31, dated 1st February, on the subject of the appointment and remuneration of ála-lambardárs.

2. The answer to the question put in the second paragraph of Mr. Dane's letter is in the affirmative. In the case stated in his third paragraph the chief headman will not be entitled to any cash *inám*. In Shahpur Kandi the ála-lambardárs will only receive the income of the cess, except where *sasaus* have already been transferred to them. *Sasaus* now held by ála-lambardárs will be commuted like the land grants enjoyed by ála-lambardárs in other parts of the district where *sasaus* are still held by ordinary lambardárs, the Settlement Officer must report as to their future treatment, unless under the terms of the grant he has himself power to resume.

3. As regards the questions raised in paragraphs 4, 6 and 7 of Mr. Dane's letter and in the letter of the Settlement Officer of Lahore, received under cover of your No. 334, dated 30th April 1890, a separate communication will be addressed to you.

No. 404, dated Lahore, 5th June 1890.

From—J. M. Douie, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Officiating Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

With reference to your No. 31, dated 1st February, I am directed to submit, for the orders of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the correspondence noted in the margin regarding the filling up of vacancies in the appointment of ála-lambardárs in districts now under settlement in the Lahore and Ráwalpindi Divisions.

Commissioner of Lahore's No. 262, dated 9th April 1890, and paragraphs 4, 6 and 7 of its enclosure.
Commissioner of Lahore's No. 334, dated 30th April 1890, and its enclosure.

2. Mr. Dane is no doubt right in thinking that ála-lambardárs need not now be appointed in those villages in Shahpur Kandi, with only a single headman, in which the office of ála-lambardár has never existed. But Mr. Young understands that the orders passed in paragraph 4 of your No. 31, dated 1st February 1890, preclude Settlement Officers from refraining to fill up vacancies in chief lambardárships even where there may be only one or two lambardárs in the village, and the appointment of chief lambardár has been held in abeyance for some time.

3. The Settlement Officer of Gurdáspur has pointed out that there are at present a number of offices which have deliberately been left vacant in villages having less than three headmen. This office letter No. 6372, dated 30th October 1888, a copy of which will be found in the printed Revenue Proceedings, Nos. 1-2 of February 1890, gave the Deputy Commissioner of Siálkot authority not to fill up vacancies till the questions then under discussion were settled. It is probable that a number of vacancies also exist in Gujrát, as the Commissioner sent to the Settlement Officer a copy of the Financial Commissioner's instructions to the Deputy Commissioner of Siálkot.

4. The Financial Commissioner does not know whether His Honor will be disposed so far to re-consider his orders as to permit Settlement Officers to use their discretion in filling up existing vacancies in villages where there are less than three lambardárs, or where two or more chief lambardárs have been appointed without any strong reason, such as the presence of two distinct clans in the village. With reference to this subject, he has nothing to add to the remarks in paragraphs 7 and 8 of his note of 23rd August 1889, and he still thinks that this action might be taken with advantage during settlement operations. It seems a pity to go on filling up such vacancies, with the probability of each Settlement Officer reporting against this part of the system when he submits his final report.

No. 56, dated 21st April 1890.

From—G. C. Walker, Esquire, Settlement Officer, Lahore,

To—The Offg. Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

With reference to the Junior Secretary to Punjab Government's letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890, conveying the orders of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor upon the system of appointing and remunerating ála-lambardárs, I have the honor to solicit orders on the following points.

2. At the end of paragraph 5 of the letter under reference, it is directed that until orders are passed for each district on the final Settlement Report all vacancies in the post of ála-lambardár may continue to be filled up as before. Is this to be understood to extend to the filling up of vacancies when they occur in a village having two ála-lambardárs?

3. In Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner's letter No. 5409, dated the 11th September 1889, it was directed that the consideration of succession to vacancies in *lambardári ináms* should, for the present, be kept in abeyance, except in the case of hereditary *ináms*. Since those orders were passed some few vacancies have occurred, and I should be glad to know whether I am now to send up proposals for filling up those vacancies.

Endorsement by the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

No. 334, dated 30th April 1890.

Copy of the foregoing forwarded to J. M. Douie, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, for orders, in continuation of this office No. 262 of the 9th instant. The Settlement Officer of Gurdáspur is also in doubt on this point (*vide* paragraph 6 of his No. 190 of the 29th ultimo).

No. 139, dated Lahore, 9th July 1890.

From—R. G. THOMSON, Esquire, Officiating Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I AM directed to reply as follows to your letter No. 404 of 5th June 1890, as to certain points connected with the *ála-lambardári* system in the districts of the Lahore and Ráwalpindi Divisions now under settlement.

2. Mr. Dane is right in thinking that ála-lambardárs need not be appointed in those villages in Shahpur Kandi where there is only a single headman and where no office of ála-lambardár has ever existed.

3. In regard to the vacancies which have been allowed to remain unfilled, the Lieutenant-Governor thinks that they should now be filled up, and that all similar vacancies in future should be filled up as they occur in ordinary course. As an exception to this, however, in villages where there are two chief headmen and one of the posts is at present vacant, the system of a single ála-lambardár may be introduced, unless the original reasons which led to the appointment of two chief headmen are still valid.

Endorsement by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

No. 4622, dated 23rd July 1890.

COPY of Punjab Government No. 139, dated 9th July 1890, forwarded to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division, in continuation of this office No. 3119, dated 17th May last, with the remark that printed copies of the correspondence will follow for distribution to Settlement Officers.

No. 320, dated Lahore, 5th May 1892.

From—A. H. DIACK, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

I AM directed to submit, for the orders of Government, a letter, No. 300, dated 16th ultimo, from the Commissioner of Lahore, with its enclosures, reporting the measures proposed by the Settlement Officer of Gurdáspur to be taken for the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gurdáspur district, in accordance with the instructions contained in Mr. Fanshawe's letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890.

2. I am to say that Mr. Young concurs throughout with the Commissioner, and supports the recommendations made by him as to the manner in which the Government orders should be carried out, including the slight modification in the Government orders proposed in his final paragraph.

3. I am to add that Mr. Young still ventures to retain the opinion which is shared by the Commissioner and all the officers who have been consulted that the ultimate extinction of the office of ála-lambardár and substitution for his emoluments of a system of *zamindári ináms* is the most simple, practicable and desirable solution of the whole question; but he abstains from further urging this view, which has not found acceptance with the Government. He thinks it right, however, to record this opinion in view of the final paragraph of the Government letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890.

No. 300, dated 16th April 1892.

From—C. M. RIVAZ, Esquire, Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

WITH reference to the orders contained in the Government letter to your address No. 31 of the 1st February 1890, I have the honor to forward, in original, Mr. Dane's report, with its annexures, on the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gurdáspur district. I also forward copy of a letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Gurdáspur, No. 116 of the 8th instant, giving his opinion on Mr. Dane's proposals. Colonel Hutchinson, it will be seen, wishes either to abolish the system altogether, or to retain it in its present form; but he seems to have overlooked that the orders contained in the Government letter above quoted were passed after the whole subject had been thoroughly considered and discussed in all its bearings. These orders are to the effect that—

(*a*) the abolition of the system may be considered as regards villages having only one or two lambardárs;

(*b*) the system should ordinarily be retained in villages having three or more lambardárs;

(*c*) where the system is abolished the *ála-lambardári* cess will merge in the village *malba* on the decease of the persons at present holding the office of ála-lambardár, and the cash *inams* which have been granted to such persons in lieu of their former *ála-lambardári máfis* will, at the same time, be utilized for providing a few *zamindári ináms* in each *zail* for selected deserving headmen.

2. Mr. Dane has reported in full detail how he proposes to comply with these instructions. He has evidently considered the matter very carefully, and I think that all his proposals, both as regards the villages where he recommends the abolition or retention of ála-lambardárs and in respect of the *zamindári ináms* to be given in each *zail* as funds become available, may appropriately be sanctioned. The general result is that, if these proposals are approved, the *ála-lambardári* system will be retained in 83 out of 700 estates in the Gurdáspur tahsíl, in 137 out of 495 in Batála, in 91 out of 747 in Shakargarh, and in 31 out of 423 in Pathánkot; or, for the whole district, in 342 out of 2,395 estates.

3. As regards the question raised in paragraph 7 of Mr. Dane's report, the lapses of *ála-lambardári ináms* and consequent creation of *zamindári ináms*, should certainly, I think, be dealt with for each *zail* separately, not for the district as a whole, and this seems evidently intended by the instructions in paragraph 4 of the Government letter.

4. As regards Mr. Dane's paragraph 8, the Government orders are that the *zamindári ináms* will be governed by the ordinary rules regarding *ináms* under the Land Revenue Act, *i. e.*, in Sections 27—29 of the rules under the Land Revenue Act, Part II. Therefore as in the case of zaildárs, land owners other than headmen will, in special cases, be eligible for these *ináms* if approved by the Commissioner. These *inám* rules should now be extended by Notification to the Gurdáspur district.

5. With reference to the suggestion in Mr. Dane's concluding paragraph, I quite agree with him that, in the case of existing ála-lambardárs appointed since the 1st October 1888, in villages where the system is to be abolished, the new cash *ála-lambardári ináms* might with advantage be utilized at once for providing *zamindári ináms*, *zail* by *zail*, as far as such means prove available. The ála-lambardárs in question would, of course, retain the proceeds of the *ála-lambardári* cess for life; so would receive adequate remuneration.

6. As I have above noticed, the Government orders are that when the *ála-lambardári* system is abolished in any village, and the existing holder of the office dies, the *ála-lambardári* cess will merge in the *malba*. I do not quite understand what is meant. It is not intended, I presume, that in villages where the *ála-lambardári* system is abolished the ordinary *malba* cess should be enchanced by one per cent. The simplest treatment of the matter would seem to be to merely direct that the *ála-lambardári* cess will cease to be levied whenever in any village where the abolition of the system is sanctioned the present ála-lambardár dies, or otherwise vacates his office.

No. 116, dated 29th March 1892.

From—Louis W. Dane, Esquire, Settlement Collector, Gurdáspur,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

In compliance with the directions contained in letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890, from Junior Secretary to Government, to Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, in the printed file relating to the *ála-lambardári* system, and your No. 869, dated 30th October 1891, I have the honor to submit a report on the changes which appear to be desirable in the system in this district.

2. As the orders at present stand, I am precluded from recommending the abolition of the office where there are three or more headmen, except where there are peculiarities of tenure which render its retention undesirable.

The amount realized by the resumption of the *ináms*, where such is proposed, is to be considered available for *zamindári ináms* to leading headmen, but nothing is to be done until the existing incumbents die. The carrying out of any proposals now made therefore must stand over for a considerable period, and they therefore lose all present interest.

3. I have prepared a list giving the main statistics for each *zail* in which the number of headmen in existence and the amount of the chief headmen's *ináms* at present have been shown. In the column of remarks the names of the villages in which the retention of the office appeared desirable have also been shown, and in an appropriate column the amount which will eventually be available for *zamindári ináms*, on the supposition that these proposals are accepted, has been entered.

Appendix A.

4. In recommending the retention of the office, I have particularly followed the opinion expressed by His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, and ordinarily retained the post where there are three or more headmen, and reduced it where there are less. In some villages, however, a difference in race or creed among the proprietors has produced bad feeling over the office, and here its abolition has been proposed irrespective of the number of headmen. Again, elsewhere the maladministration of the headmen has been conspicuous; so here, also, reduction has been proposed. In some estates again the revenue is insignificant, and it seemed quite useless to retain the office. To counterbalance these special cases of reduction, it has been suggested that the office should be retained in some estates where there were less than three headmen and in which the importance of the charge seemed to warrant special measures.

5. With the list is a report on the circumstances of each *zail*, giving briefly the reasons for retaining or reducing the office and suggesting certain arrangements for the eventual grant of *zamindári ináms*, and the result of these proposals is also shown in the list.

6. The appointment of two or more chief headmen was practically invariably due to the existence of peculiarities of tenure, which rendered the creation of a single office certain to cause bad feeling, and so the abolition of the office has been suggested in almost all of such cases, as the double appointments have been absolutely useless. List B shows the estates in which there are more than one headman, and it will be seen that such appointments were only made in the villages of Mr. Prinsep's proposed Batála tahsíl.

If further information is required as to the villages in which the reduction of the office has been proposed, the best plan would be to consult the new *zail* books which give full particulars. When the scheme is ultimately sanctioned, columns can be added in these to show the estates in which a chief headman is retained and the amount of *inám* and *pachotra* which he will receive, and a note can be entered showing the number of *ináms* in each *zail* and the names of the holders, so that the book may form a complete record of the circle. A list of the estates in which the office is to be reduced will be a very long one, but of course it can be prepared if required.

7. A point requiring orders is, whether a grant is to be made as soon as the resumptions in the whole district admit of this, or whether this should be deferred in the case of each *zail* until the resumptions in that *zail* have reached an amount admitting of this. If the former procedure is to be adopted, the life of the District Officer will be unendurable. I forward herewith a rough English Register, which has been prepared of the petitions already received for such grants, on which I have ventured to record my opinion of the qualifications of each applicant, trusting that the notes may be of use to the District Officer in matters of general administration and appointment of zaildárs, &c., though it is not likely that any of the applicants will live to see the day when these *zamindári ináms* will come into force, if the orders now in force are to hold good. The register is very rough, but will give an idea of the tornado of applications which will overwhelm the Collector if the whole of the candidates in the district are allowed to compete for each vacancy. If the grants in a *zail* are restricted to that *zail*, it will be much simpler, and the *sofed-poshi* in the *zail* can act as assistants to the zaildár, and prominent men of subordinate tribes in the *zail* can thus be adequately rewarded.

8. I also venture to suggest that the restriction of such grants to headmen only should be removed, as the strict enforcement of the hereditary right principle often gives us very indifferent headmen, and other sharers are frequently much better qualified for such rewards. As in the case of zaildárs, it might be specified that the grant should ordinarily go to a headman, but that, for reasons to be specially recorded, the Collector may, if he thinks fit, award an *inám* to any revenue-paying proprietor in the *zail*.

9. If it is considered desirable to make a start in the system at once, chief headmen put in since 1st October 1888 in estates where the office is to be reduced might well lose their *ináms*, as they have all been appointed subject to this express condition. This would probably enable the Collector to award at once one *inám* in each *zail* to the man who has done best during settlement. Otherwise the execution of the scheme must be deferred to a dim futurity when the circumstances out of which the proposals have originated have been entirely forgotten, so that it would hardly be worth while to effect any change in the existing system.

It has not been possible to send in this report before, as the distribution in Pathánkot was not complete, and, till this was done, it could not be ascertained how much the amount of each chief headman's *inám* would be. Even now trifling errors may still remain in the list, though this has been very carefully re-checked with the comparative demand statements.

APPENDIX A.

AN ABSTRACT OF PROPOSALS FOR REORGANIZING THE ALA-LAMBARDARI AND SOFED-POSHI ARRANGEMENTS.

APPEN

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsíl.	No.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Gurdáspur.	1	Jandi Chaunta (Biánpur).	14,996	16,790	8,736	62	34	28	6	34
	2	Awankh	15,132	23,330	16,436	81	38	26	12	38
	3	Bahrámpur ...	17,209	27,680	15,992	85	43	34	9	43
	4	Mirzapur	14,301	20,735	10,482	92	63	61	2	63
	5	Sangowála ...	20,050	23,440	14,005	85	45	36	9	45
	6	Gurdáspur ...	19,511	28,870	19,829	89	42	31	11	42

DIX A.

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams.			Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
2	22	79	101	1	40	Chaunta, Jharoli.
				1	39	
				2	79	
4	62	113	175	1	40	Paniar, Awankh, Khaira, Bharath.
				1	40	
				1	33	
				3	113	
5	108	112	220	1	40	Jhabkara, Murara, Sultáni, Bahmani, Dadwan.
				1	40	
				1	32	
					112	
2	19	101	120	1	51	Chakri, Galri.
				1	50	
				2	101	
3	34	88	122	1	44	Bhopar, Tung, Adi.
				1	44	
				2	88	
5	77	134	211	1	45	Hemrájpur, Babeháli, Tibri, Pahra Ghurála.
				1	45	
				1	44	
					134	

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsíl.	No.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three head-men.	Three or more head-men.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Gurdaspur—continued.	7	Gurdás Nangal ...	15,316	27,310	13,571	80	39	28	11	39
	8	Tálibpur ...	19,753	18,235	9,977	78	47	41	6	47
	9	Kahnuwán ...	22,123	14,845	10,537	65	33	28	5	33
	10	Bhaini Mián Khan	16,239	16,315	7,908	49	31	28	3	31
	11	Pheru Chechi ...	18,267	25,500	12,332	82	37	27	10	37
	12	Sethiáli ...	15,526	26,565	11,367	77	34	23	11	34

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams.			Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
6	72	150	222	1	50	Jaura, Chittrau, Nabipur, Sidhwan, Gurdás Nangal, Jhawar, Indranwála.
				1	50	
				1	50	
				3	150	
2	22	91	113	1	45	Jaggatpur, Tálibpur.
				1	46	
				2	91	
1	28	81	109	1	41	Kahnuwán.
				1	40	
				2	81	
2	27	62	89	1	30	Kotli Harchandan, Sahopur.
				1	32	
				2	62	
5	66	152	218	1	52	Kot Todarmal, Tughalwála, Bheri, Ghorewáh, Bhattián.
				1	50	
				1	50	
				3	152	
5	86	167	253	1	57	Bhumbli, Roránwáli, Sathiáli, Kála Bála, Thikariwála.
				1	55	
				1	55	
				3	167	

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsíl.	No.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Gurdaspur—*concluded.*	13	Dheriwála ...	18,994	33,730	16,252	78	31	20	11	31
	14	Sohal ...	20,821	37,225	21,349	88	37	26	...	37
	15	Ghuman ...	14,618	29,970	17,166	72	36	27	8	...
	16	Kot Santokh Rái ...	16,752	29,355	14,412	81	39		12	38
	17	Kalánaur ...	29,156	27,200	17,414	67	33	26	7	33
	18	Shahur ...	17,082	20,595	12,835	82	40	28	12	40
		Total ...	316,846	4,47,690	250,600	1,393	702	544	156	700

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams.			Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
10	164	140	304	1	50	Satkolia, Sekhwan, Pasnawála, Thákar Sandhu, Fatteh, Faizulla Chak, Zaffarwál, Naushabra, Dehriwála, Dháriwál.
				1	45	
				1	45	
				3	140	
7	128	166	294	1	55	Tibar, Babri Nangal, Ráman, Kaliánpur, Kaler Khurd, Singhpur, Sohal.
				1	55	
				1	56	
				3	166	
6	112	140	252	1	48	Kaler Kalán, Waráich, Godhupur, Ghuman Kalán, Ghuman Khurd, Kailch Kalán.
				1	46	
				1	46	
				3	140	
10	122	109	231	1	55	Saprai, Shekh Kabír, Buche Nangal, Alowál Kot Santokh Rái, Sohari, Dula Nangal, Bakhariwál, Khirah Kotli, Bangowáni.
				1	54	
				2	109	
2	30	104	134	1	54	Lakhan Kalán, Kalánaur.
				1	50	
				2	104	
6	33	81	114	1	41	Dostpur, Chandu Vadála, Sarga Chak, Dehriwála, Chak Shahur, Ruliána.
				1	40	
				2	81	
83	1,212	2,070	3,282	45	2,070	

APPENDIX

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil.	Number.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Batala.	1	Chima Khuddi ...	21,157	27,628	15,252	81	38	26	12	38
	2	Pindarori	26,179	24,430	17,936	58	24	16	8	24
	3	Bhani	24,160	38,860	17,053	81	28	13	12	25
	4	Bhaja	18,204	26,068	14,085	71	33	23	10	33
	5	Chaudhriwála ...	19,518	32,662	17,885	80	37	24	11	35
	6	Talwandi Lál Singh	16,167	30,064	16,840	70	30	22	8	30

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams.			Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
12	139	87	226	1	45	Balharwál, Bhittewál Sukhowál, Dháriwál Chima, Galowal, Sukala, Ghuman, Nand Dukoha, Paddi, Kotli.
				1	42	
				2	87	
5	65	81	146	1	40	Mari Buchián, Mari Panwan, Makesh, Dogar Aulakh, Maur.
				1	41	
				2	81	
9	169	159	328	1	50	Bham, Harchowál, Khajala, Thariyewál.
				1	50	
				1	59	
				3	159	
8	95	110	205	1	55	Dilah, Bajju, Mikeh, Boiewál, Bhoma, Pindori Nangal, Ladha Munda, Channe, Amín Kot.
				1	55	
				2	110	
9	136	135	271	1	45	Bujhinwáli, Chaudhriwála, Ranghar Nanga, Vairo-Nangal, Záhadpur, Jaito Sargal Chahal, Dhadiála, Ammu Nangal.
				1	45	
				1	45	
				3	135	
8	106	181	287	1	61	Purian Kalán, Karwalián, Dholpur, Talwandi Lál Singh, Hardo Jhanda, Bal, Kotla Sharf, Dhadiála.
				1	60	
				1	60	
				3	181	

APPENDIX

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil.	No.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Batálá—continued.	7	Batála	15,488	32,242	38,193	53	23	18	5	23
	8	Dalla	19,350	32,055	15,649	67	33	24	9	33
	9	Kot Karam Chand	15,147	28,779	18,493	73	39	28	9	37
	10	Aliwál	15,052	29,405	18,132	57	27	18	7	25
	11	Mari	21,846	38,880	28,108	82	35	22	9	31

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	AMOUNT OF SARPANCHI INAMS.			PROPOSED SOFED-POSHI INAMS.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
4	180	127	307	1	40	Basarpur, Masanián, Diwániwálal, Batala.
				1	42	
				1	45	
				3	127	
10	186	104	290	1	54	Sangrai, Panjgaráin, Kahlon, Lil Kalán, Nangal Baghbánán, Rámpur, Talwandi, Jhunglán, Vadála Guranthián, Dunia Sandhu Dalla.
				1	50	
				2	104	
9	134	143	277	1	50	Harsián, Diálgarh, Kotla Sabia, Bhullar Jaura Singha, Kot Karm Chand, Khan Fatta Bhághowála, Winjwán.
				1	45	
				1	48	
				3	143	
7	112	122	234	1	40	Kastiwál, Talwandi Bharath, Dabanwála, Ghoga, Marrar, Raliáli Kalán, Chandumanj.
				1	40	
				1	42	
				3	122	
9	158	208	366	1	52	Ghaniake Bangar, Jangla, Kila Desa Singh, Sarchur, Nasarke, Kotli Thapatan Khaira, Lodi Nangal, Fattehgarh.
				1	52	
				1	52	
				1	52	
				4	208	

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil	Number.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Batala—*concluded.*	12	Baddowál ...	23,068	34,863	19,245	87	38	23	11	34
	13	Shahpur Jajan ...	19,708	31,252	18,821	89	41	29	11	40
	14	Dehr ...	19,307	30,937	17,197	89	36	20	15	35
	15	Singhpur ...	30,335	38,999	27,266	113	54	39	13	52
		Total ...	304,686	4,77,124	300,155	1,151	516	345	150	495

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	AMOUNT OF SARPANCHI INAMS.			PROPOSED SOFED-POSHI INAMS.		
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
8	93	185	278	1	65	Kala Afghánán, Chandu Suja, Teja Kalán, Dadu Jahád, Hardorawal, Loharánwáli, Dogar, Jhinjián Kalán.
				1	60	
				1	60	
				3	185	
12	151	137	288	1	45	Bhaleki, Talwandi Ráman, Níko Sarái, Kuthiála, Shahpur Jajan, Padda, Udhowálí Kalán, Udhowáli Khurd, Gillánwáli, Basantkot, Abdal and Ratta.
				1	45	
				1	47	
				3	137	
14	114	98	212	1	48	Sarwáli, Nangal, Dalam, Fazalabad, Rái Chak Chainewal, Mamman, Durgawal, Dhilwan, Shikar, Kansinke Talla Dehr, Gawara, Rahímabad.
				1	50	
				2	98	
13	96	168	264	1	55	Shahpur Guraiya, Bhagtana Bahrwál Samrai, Talwandi Guraiya, Thetharke, Ghola Dhola Puranawál, Gunian, Mulowáli, Mangián, Gur Chak, Ghaniake Bet, Mansúr.
				1	55	
				1	58	
				3	168	
137	1,934	2,045	3,979	41	2,045	

APPENDIX

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil.	No.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Shakargarh.	1	Darman ...	23,521	20,905	15,161	60	45	46	...	46
	2	Chak Nihála Chhajwál.	30,302	25,620	21,551	109	78	76	2	73
	3	Ramri ...	22,303	29,865	19,355	63	58	58	...	58
	4	Gumtala ...	16,622	25,265	16,127	90	53	45	8	53
	5	Shakargarh ...	24,243	24,385	18,559	76	47	44	3	47

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	AMOUNT OF SARPANCHI INAMS.			PROPOSED SOFED-POSHI INAMS.		
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
4	39	164	203	1	55	Barri, Bhoi, Jarpal, Bhagwánpur.
				1	55	
				1	54	
				3	164	
6	38	213	251	1	83	Bharkhanián, Laisur Kalán, Delra, Bher Natla Kalán, Chajwál.
				1	65	
				1	65	
				3	213	
6	69	228	297	1	60	Sathiála, Barápind, Dudu Chak, Ramri Mohlan, Tatwal.
				1	60	
				1	55	
				1	53	
				4	228	
8	85	167	252	1	55	Nadala, Ago Munda, Mailu Sailu, Kala Chechi, Kailah, Bhattián, Chaura, Ghumtala.
				1	55	
				1	57	
				3	167	
7	66	173	239	1	60	Muthi, Phalwári, Jemwal, Shakargarh, Khanowál, Hansowáli, Jhangi.
				1	60	
				1	53	
				3	173	

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ila

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil.	Number.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Shakargarh—*continued.*	6	Sukho Chak ...	29,148	25,090	22,385	72	50	49	1	50
	7.	Masrúr ...	21,648	15,490	15 091	61	49	47	2	49
	8	Ikhláspur ...	14,098	16,425	11,231	47	39	39	...	39
	9	Nainakot ...	21,928	27,645	17,314	91	60	55	5	60
	10	Bhati ...	20,820	24,415	17,496	85	53	48	5	53

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams.			Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
6	46	201	247	1	50	Japolata, Sukho Chak, Chalrana, Chamál Ratto Chak, Shahpur Bhangu.
				1	50	
				1	50	
				1	51	
				4	201	
1	9	143	152	1	60	Bagga.
				1	43	
				1	40	
				3	143	
1	12	144	156	1	50	Ikhláspur.
				1	50	
				1	44	
				3	144	
5	59	199	258	1	50	Beri Khurd, Tarpai, Sujowál, Hájipur Gujrán, Sarang Chak, Khadial.
				1	50	
				1	50	
				1	49	
				4	199	
5	62	155	217	1	50	Fathehpur, Chatri Baruti, Dinpur Kalán, Mansúra.
				1	50	
				1	55	
				3	155	

APPENDIX

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil	Number.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three headmen.	Three or more headmen.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Shakargarh—concluded.	11	Báramanga ...	16,939	28,410	14,430	69	36	29	7	36
	12	Basankot ...	19,406	33,005	15,633	79	36	26	10	36
	13	Adu ...	17,031	25,230	12,970	75	33	21	12	33
	14	Mundi Khel ...	6,813	14,375	8,571	47	25	21	4	25
	15	Kanjrúr Gurála ...	12,942	23,440	13,444	55	46	42	4	4
	16	Ghadiála ...	12,754	19,620	11,018	66	38	32	6	38
		Total ...	310,518	3,79,135	250,336	1,148	747	678	69	747

A—*continued.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—continued.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams. Retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams. Available for grant.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams. Total.	Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams. Number.	Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams. Amount.	Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
7	116	165	281	1	55	Bakral, Jugial, Kot Doába, Bassu Bazurg, Pindi Kalán, Chakra.
				1	55	
				1	55	
				3	165	
11	209	117	326	1	60	Channi Taka, Jarmián, Jhanda, Fathuki Chak, Basankot, Dalípaur Bura, Dallanangal, Panwan, Nokhar Kotla Kúhiwan, Khanpur Bhikho Chak, Dera Núr Malik.
				1	57	
				2	117	
9	166	47	213	1	47	Rura, Ada, Gujar Tor, Pairewál Pakhoke, Maddoke, Gol, Buláki Chak, Doda.
4	64	82	146	1	32	Bustan, Langah, Mundi Khel, Dera Afghánan.
				1	50	
				2	82	
4	32	198	230	1	98	Gakka Kotli, Mirzewáli, Ghanagran, Manji Tor.
				1	50	
				1	50	
				3	198	
7	84	112	196	1	55	Mandiála, Akeki, Malla, Fazalpur, Ghona, Ghadiála, Mengru.
				1	57	
				2	112	
91	1,156	2,508	3,664	46	2,508	

APPENDIX

An abstract of proposals for reorganizing the Ala

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
						Number of		Number of Villages.		
Tahsil.	Number.	Zail.	Area.	Revenue.	Population.	Headmen.	Chief headmen.	Less than three head-men.	Three or more head-men.	Total.
			Acres.	Rs.						
Pathankot.	1	Bambia ...	12,445	14,465	7,784	43	9	31	1	32
	2	Kiri Khurd ...	12,878	23,000	9,770	42	9	21	4	25
	3	Kathlaur ...	17,805	26,125	10,646	62	13	39	3	42
	4	Gajju ...	14,792	19,135	11,335	87	28	45	7	52
	5	Targarh ..	14,665	30,110	13,332	80	25	32	7	39
	6	Parmánand ...	18,849	23,325	11,213	103	37	42	13	55
	7	Mírthal ...	24,723	22,105	11,197	71	11	48	5	53
	8	Pathánkot ...	22,637	29,610	24,824	74	22	40	7	47
	9	Kahnpur ...	28,844	25,990	18,060	59	11	46	2	42
	10	Shahpur ...	66,675	22,916	22,727	35	5	29	1	30
		Total ...	234,313	2,36,781	140,880	656	170	373	50	423
		District Total...	1,166,363	15,40,730	941,971	4,348	2,135	1,940	425	2,365

A—*concluded.*

Lambardári and Sofed-poshi arrangements—concluded.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number of villages in which chief headmen are retained.	Amount of Sarpanchi Inams.			Proposed Sofed-poshi Inams.		Names of villages in which it is proposed to retain chief headmen.
	Retained.	Available for grant.	Total.	Number.	Amount.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	
1	15	42	57	1	42	Bambial.
4	76	29	105	1	29	Silionti, Dalpat, Kharkhera Jhumbar.
2	29	61	90	1	61	Muthi, Sahawára Kalán.
1	12	96	108	1	50	Táragarh.
				1	46	
				2	96	
6	87	140	227	1	50	Narot, Bhoya, Balsuya, Gobindsar, Lahri, Báwián, Murádpur.
				1	50	
				1	40	
				3	140	
8	32	130	162	1	45	Parmánand, Kataru Chak, Dhobra.
				1	45	
				1	40	
				3	130	
3	10	...	10	...	...	Naushahra Nálbandán, Choban, Lado Chak, Gurah.
2	28	85	113	1	40	Sujánpur, Dehriwála, Azízpur.
				1	45	
				2	85	
4	...	32	32	1	40	Tharial, Ránipur, Ghoh, Jugial, including Rs. 43 grant held by Kanhaya at present.
				1	35	
				2	75	
5	...	...	...	1	100	Thara, Kot, Phangota, Hara, Tirhari if Diála's pension of Rs. 150 and the Bhamlada *jágír* of Rs. 75 are maintained as *sofed poshi* grants.
				1	75	
				1	50	
				3	225	
31	289	615	904	18	883	
342	4,591	7,238	11,829	150	7,506	

LOUIS W. DANE,
Settlement Collector.

APPENDIX B.

List of Villages in which there were more than one Chief Headman.

	BATALA.		
1	Mathola	2	Office to be abolished.
2	Basrai	2	Ditto.
3	Bhámri	2	Ditto.
4	Ammun Nangal	2	One chief headman retained.
5	Bhamboi	2	Office to be abolished.
6	Winjwan	2	One sarpanch retained.
7	Dharmkot Bagga	2	Office to be abolished, as there were only two headmen.
8	Saidpur	2	Ditto ditto.
9	Dabanwála	2	One sarpanch retained.
10	Jangla	2	Ditto.
11	Ghaniaki Bangar	3	* Reduction of offices recommended.
12	Qila Desa Singh	2	One sarpanch retained.
13	Murídki	2	Office to be abolished.
14	Baddowál Kalán	2	Ditto.
15	Hardo Rawal	2	One sarpanch retained.
16	Dila Teja	2	* As in Ghaniaki.
17	Ramial	2	Only two headmen. Office should be reduced.
18	Kotli Súrat Malli	2	Office to be reduced.
19	Bhagtána Tuliánwála	2	Only two headmen who are dead. Office to be reduced.
20	Mansúr	2	One sarpanch retained.
	GURDASPUR.		
21	Bhikanwál	2	One sarpanch retained.
22	Ghuman Kalán	2	Office to be abolished.
23	Thikariwál	2	* Reduction of one office recommended by Collector.
24	Sekhwán	2	One reduced already.

LOUIS W. DANE,

Settlement Collector.

TAHSIL GURDASPUR.

Zail Jandi Chaunta.—A *zail* of Muhammadans, Náru and Manhás Rájpúts. Tahsíldár proposes to retain in Chaunta and Jharoli, and to reduce in Dhaki, Katowál, Chak Alia, Habibpur and Kalijpur (no *inám*) where there are three or more headmen. In all of these cases I agree with him, as the villages are not important. The amount available for grant can be given in two *ináms*, one of Rs. 40 and one of Rs. 39.

Zail Auankh.—Rájpúts (Harchands, Paniárs and Narús). Tahsíldár proposes to retain *sarpanch* in Paniár, and to reduce in Balehpindi, Kairah, Awankh, Dida, Mughrála, Dhamrai, Bara, Jakaria and Rasúlpur; also in Bharat and Naurangpur in which there is no *inám* at present. As regards Awankh, Kairah and Bharat, I do not agree with him, as these are important estates. As regards the others the revenue is insignificant, or there are special reasons, such as bad blood, for reducing, and I concur. The amount available for grant is, therefore, reduced to Rs. 113, which can be given in three *ináms*, two of Rs. 40 each and one of Rs. 33.

Zail Bahrámpur.—A *zail* of mixed tribes, Harchands, Patháns, Sainis, Jats and Aráins. Tahsíldár proposes to retain in Jhabkara, Murára, Sultáni, Bahmni, Dadwan, and to reduce in Makaura, Niwan Dhankala, Pindi Ranghrán and Ráipur, where there are three or more headmen. These are all unimportant villages except Makaura, and the owners here are also owners in Jhabkara; so the appointment is not required. In Niwan Dhankala there is a constant feud. I therefore concur. The amount available for grant, Rs. 112, can be divided into three *ináms*, two of Rs. 40 each and one of Rs. 32.

Zail Mirzápur.—Mixed Patháns, Gujars and Jats. Tahsíldár recommends retention of chief headman in Chakri where there is no *inám*, and reduction in Galri where there are five headmen, on the ground of disputes. I think the office must be retained, and this leaves Rs. 101 available, which might be given in two *ináms*, one of Rs. 51 and one of Rs. 50. If admissible and if the arrangement for a special chaprási is not approved, Labha zaildár could get one of these to make up his *pachotra* to a proper amount.

Zail Sangowála.—A *zail* of mixed Jats (Wahla *gôt* predominating). Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Bhopar and Tung, and to reduce in Alharpindi, Adi, Kathgarh, Chak Aráián, where there are three or more headmen. Adi is an important village, and the office should be retained, though the present headmen are not much. The others are small, unimportant villages. The amount available for *ináms*, Rs. 88, can be divided into two grants of Rs. 44 each.

Zail Gurdáspur.—A *zail* of mixed Jats, the Paniár *gôt* perhaps predominating. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Hemrájpur, Bahchali Tibri, and to reduce in Hayátnagar, Kála Nangal, Bariar, Abul Khair, Hardobathwála, Ghurála, Pahra and Uncha Becharagh, where there are three or more headmen. Bariar and Abul Khair are very mixed villages, and so the chief headman is not required, and Kála Nangal and Uncha are unimportant estates; so as to these I concur. Pahra and Ghurála are very troublesome villages, and there are grounds for removing the chief headmen as a punishment, but under Government orders the office must be retained. This reduces amount available for *ináms* to Rs. 134, which can be divided into three *ináms* of Rs. 45, Rs. 45 and Rs. 44.

Zail Gurdás Nangal.—A *zail* of mixed *góts* of Jats. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headmanship in Indranwála and to reduce in Tatle. Purowál Aráián, Jaura Chittaran, Purowál Jattán, Nabipur, Talwandi, Sidhwán, Salempur Afghánán, Gurdás Nangal, Jhawar and Baju Chak, where there are three or more headmen. Jaura Chittaran, Nabipur, Sidhwán, Gurdás Nangal and Ghaman are large villages, and under the orders of Government the office must be maintained, though the first is a very troublesome estate and the headmen have not worked well. The others are small etsates, and there is no reason for the retention of the *sarpanch*. This leaves Rs. 150 available for *ináms*, which can be divided into three grants of Rs. 50 each.

Zail Tálibpur.—Banis Jats predominate. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Jagatpur and Tálibpur, and to reduce in Khojepur China and Pakhowál (no *ináms*), in which there are three or more headmen.

I concur, as these are very unimportant villages. The amount available for *ináms*, Rs. 91, can be divided into two grants of Rs. 45 and Rs. 46.

Zail Kahnúwán.—Main tribes Harchand Rájpúts and miscellaneous. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headman in Kahnúwán, and to reduce in the following estates where there are three or more headmen: Ranwál, Chak Yakúb, Dalla Goria Lamni. These are all small estates, and there are no special reasons for maintaining the office; so I concur. The amount available for *ináms* here is only Rs. 81, as most of the area is still waste and not assessed. I think two *ináms*, one of Rs. 41 and one of Rs. 40, might be given.

Zail Bhaini Mián Khán.—In this *zail* the Gujars predominate, but there are some Sainis, Labánás and Harchands. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headman only in Kotli Harchandán, and to reduce in Salhopur Bujar and Munnan Kalán. The two latter are unimportant villages, but Salhopur is a large estate of some prominence; so, though the people are not well-behaved, the office must, I suppose, be retained. This

reduces the amount available for *ináms* to Rs. 62, as many of the grants had been swept away and others were still waste and not assessed. This may be given in two *ináms*, one of Rs. 30 and one of Rs. 32.

Zail Pheru Chechi.—In this *zail* the Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headmen in Kot Todarmal, Tughalwála, Bheri, Ghorewah and Bhattián. These are all large and populous estates with more than three headmen, and I agree with Tahsíldár's proposals. In Kunt Salabpur, Pindori, Datarpur Bagol, Hambowál there are three or more headmen, but these are unimportant estates or not well conducted, and there is no special reason for retaining the chief headman there; so consider that the office may well be reduced. There is a saving of Rs. 152 which can be allotted in one *inám* of Rs. 52 and two of Rs. 50 each.

Zail Sathiáli.—In this *zail* the Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headmen in Bhumbli Koranwáli, Sathiáli, Kála Bála and Thikariwála. These are all large villages with more than three headmen, so I agree. In Saraspur, Bakhtpur, Sidhwán, Bhakhari Harni, Kot Jagráj, Jogi Churian, Rajada it has not been considered necessary to retain the chief headmen, either because the appointment has given rise to much jealousy or the estates are unimportant. The amount available for grant, Rs. 167, should be divided into three *ináms*, one of Rs. 57 and two, of Rs. 55 a year each.

Zail Dehriwála.—A Jat *zail* in which the Dháriwál Jats predominate. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Satkoha Sekhwán, Pasnawála, Thakar Sandhu Tatleh, and to reduce in Zaffarwál, Faizulla Chak, Naushahra Majja Singh, Arjanpur, Dehriwála and Dháriwál. Although the Kakezais of Faizulla Chak are useless and there is bad blood in Zaffarwál, they are large villages, and the office must under Government orders be retained. So also with Naushahra, Dehriwála and Dháriwál. Arjanpur is a very small estate and unimportant; so the office may be reduced. This reduces the amount available for *ináms* to Rs. 140, which might be given in three *ináms* of Rs. 45, Rs. 45 and Rs. 50.

Zail Sohal.—A *zail* of miscellaneous Jats. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Tibar, Babri Nangal, Rámán, Kaliánpur, Kaler Khurd, Singhpur, and to reduce in Mustafabad Jattan, Sohal, Fatteh Nangal, Ikhláspur and Bál, where there are three or more headmen. Sohal he proposes to reduce, as the zaildár lives there and has already an *inám*. This is not a sufficient reason, and the *sarpanch* here must be maintained. As to the others, I agree, as the villages are not important and the headmen have not behaved well. This reduces the amount available for *ináms* to Rs. 166, which could be given in three *ináms*, two of Rs. 55 each and one of Rs. 56.

Zail Ghuman.—A Jat *zail* in which the Ghuman *gôt* predominates. Tahsíldár proposes to retain in Kaler Kalán, Waráich, Godhupura, and to reduce in Mustafapur, Bolewál, Ghuman Khurd, Ghuman Kalán, Kaileh Kalán in which there are three or more headmen. The village of Ghuman Kalán has two chief headmen, as Mr. Prinsep noted that it was very large and required two heads. The consequence has been that it has been very badly managed. The Jats are all of one *gôt*, though some are Hindús and some Muhammadans. One chief headman should be retained, but one is quite enough, and the competition between the Hindús and Muhammadans will perhaps keep them straight. One office should be reduced. In Ghuman Khurd and Kaileh Kalán I think the chief headman should also be retained. In Mustafapur and Bolewál, owing to constant fights about the office, there is much bad blood, and as they are not important villages, the office may well be reduced. This leaves Rs. 140 available for *ináms* which can be distributed as follows: one *inám* of Rs. 48 and two of Rs. 46 each.

Zail Kot Santokh Rái.—A *zail* of mixed Jats. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Saprai and Shekh Kabír (in which there are only two headmen, owing to the Saprai bungalow), Buche Nangal, Alowál, Kot Santokh Rái, Sahari, Dula Nangal, and to reduce in Qázipur Awán, Bhakhariwál, Khairah Kotli, Chotepur, Bangowáni, and also in Kotla and Chak Nurowáli. Bhakhariwál, Khairah Kotli and Bangowáni are important villages, and though the two last named have given a great deal of trouble during settlement and the appointment has given rise to much bad blood, I suppose the appointment must be retained. In Bhakhariwál there are two chief headmen, though only three headmen as one Taraj was Hindu and one Muhammadan. This seems hardly a sufficient reason, and one office should be reduced. This reduces the amount available for *inám* to Rs. 109. Saprai and Shekh Kabír really do not require chief headmen; but as the bungalow gives them a little trouble, I do not oppose Tahsíldár's suggestion. Two *ináms* of Rs. 55 and Rs. 54 proposed.

Zail Kalánáur.—A *zail* of Aráins and miscellaneous Jats. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headmen in Lakhan Kalán, and to reduce in Kalánáur, Dalelpur, Mast Kot, Shahpur and Panwán. As regards the last four, I concur, as they are not important estates in any way, but in Kalánaur the office must be retained, though the present headman is most inefficient. This will reduce the amount available to Rs. 104, which can be given in two *ináms*—one of Rs. 54 and one of Rs. 50.

Zail Shahur.—A *zail* of Kahlon and Goraia Jats. Tahsíldár proposes to retain in Dostpur, Chandu Vadála, Surja Chak, Dehriwála, Chak Shahur Ruliána. In the three last villages there are no *ináms*. He proposes to reduce in Kamálpur, Shahur, Barila Khurd,

Rosa, Pakhiwán, Mír Kachána in which there are three headmen or more. These are unimportant villages, and I agree in his proposal. The amount available for grant is only Rs. 81, as in many of the villages the *inám* had been washed away, and in others it is *kallar* waste. Two *ináms*, one of Rs. 41 and one of Rs. 40, might be given.

LOUIS W. DANE,

Settlement Collector.

TAHSIL BATALA.

Zail Chima Khuddi.—A Jat *zail* with the Ghuman and Chima *gôts* predominating. The villages are all large, in which there are three headmen, except Galowál, and there are no peculiarities of tenure ; so it is not necessary to reduce the chief headmen, except in villages where there are less than three headmen. It is proposed to retain the office in Balharwál, Bhittiwál, Sukhowál, Dhariwál, Chiman, Galowál, Sukála, Ghuman, Mand, Dokáha, Padde, Kotli. The amount available for *ináms*, Rs. 87, can be given in two grants, one of Rs. 45 and one of Rs. 42.

Zail Pindarori.—A mixed *zail* of Jats and Patháns, Sainis, &c. The Pannu Jats predominate. In the following villages there are three or more headmen : Mári Buchian, Kángra Samrai, Mári Panwári, Mahesh, Dogar, Aulakh, Maur, Wariah. Nos. 2, 3 and 8 are very small places, and the retention of a *sarpanch* is undesirable. Elsewhere there is no reason under the orders of Government for abolishing the office, and it may be retained. The amount available for grant, Rs. 81, may be divided into two *ináms* of Rs. 40 and Rs. 41.

Zail Bhain.—Riais and Khaireh Jats predominate. In Bhám, Harchowál, Khojala, Thariyewál, Harpura, Dhirah, Koháli, Dhapai, Kandíla there are more than three headmen and no peculiarities of tenure, so the system is retained. In Bhamri, Basrai and Mathola there are more than three headmen and two *sarpanches* in each village. The double appointment has never worked well, and was made in the first and second owing to difference of religion, and in the third estate owing to difference of *gôt*. Constant squabbles result, and I recommend the total reduction of the office owing to these peculiarities of tenure, or at any rate the retention of one *sarpanch* only. Amount available to be given in three *ináms*, two of Rs. 50 each and one of Rs. 59.

Zail Bhoja.—A Jat *zail*, Paddeh, Bhindar and Ghuman Jats predominating. In the following villages there are more than three headmen : Wilah Bajju, Mikeh Bolewál, Bhoma, Pindori Nangal, Bhagtupura,* Chak Bhagtupura,* Ladha Munda, Channi and Amukot. Except those marked* these are all large estates, and the office may be retained. In Bhagtupura and Chak Bhagtupura the office should be reduced, as they are small, unimportant estates. The amount available for grant, Rs. 110, can be divided into two grants of Rs. 55 each.

Zail Chaudhriwála.—The Gadari Jats predominate. In the following there are three or more headmen. Bujhiánwáli, Chaudhriwála, Rangar Nangal, Vairo Nangal, Zahadpura, Jaito Sarpa, Cháhal, Ammu Nangal, Dhadiáia, Ghas and Bhamboi. In Ammu Nangal and Bhamboi there are two *sarpanches*, as in the first there are mixed tribes, and in the second two *abádis*. Constant squabbles have resulted in Bhamboi. I therefore recommend the total abolition of the office there. The two *abádís* are close together in Ammu Nangal, and it is a small estate ; so one *sarpanch* is quite enough. Ghas is also a small estate and unimportant. No *sarpanch* is required. Elsewhere the office can be retained. The amount available for grant, Rs. 135, can be divided into three *ináms* of Rs. 45 each.

Zail Talwandi Lál Singh.—A *zail* of mixed Jats, some Randháwás. In the following estates there are three or more headmen : Purián Kalán, Karwalián, Dholpura, Talwandi Lál Singh, Hardo Jhanda, Bal, Kotla Sharaf, Dhadiála. They are all large and have no special peculiarities of tenure ; so the office may be retained. The amount available for grant, Rs. 181, can be given in three *ináms*—Rs. 61, Rs. 60 and Rs. 60.

Zaíl Batála.—Aráins predominate. In the following villages there are three or more headmen : Basarpura, Chapiánwáli, Masanian, Dewaniwál Batála. Chapiánwáli is a very small, unimportant place, and the office can be reduced. In the others it can be retained. The amount available for grant can be divided into three *ináms* of Rs. 40, Rs. 42, and Rs. 45.

Zail Dalla.—Mixed Jats. The office can be retained in the following estates, where there are three or more headmen : Sangrai, Panjgaráin, Kahloan, Lil Kalán, Nangal Bághbánán, Rámpura, Talwandi Jhunglán, Vadála Granthián, Dunia Sandhu. The amount available for grant, Rs. 104, can be distributed into two *ináms*—one of Rs. 50 and one of Rs. 54. The *sarpanchi* in Dalla, where there are only two headmen, might also perhaps be retained, as it is a very heavy village.

Zail Kot Karm Chand.—Mixed Jats, among whom the Butárs probably predominate. In the following villages, where there are three or more headmen, the office may be retained: Harsian, Diálgarh, Kotla Sahia, Bhullar, Jaura Singhán, Kot Karm Chand, Khán Fatta, Bhágowála Winjwán. In the latter two *sarpanches* were appointed, as it was said there were two villages on different sides of the canal. This is not now the case, so one office should be reduced. The amount available for grant can be divided into three *ináms* —one of Rs. 50, one of Rs. 45 and one of Rs. 48.

Zail Aliwál.—Mixed Jats, the Bhoperai *gôt* predominating. In the following villages there are three or more headmen, so the office is retained: Kastiwál, Talwandi Bharoth, Dabanwála Ghoga, Marrar, Raliáli Kalán, Chandu Mauj. In Dabanwála two *sarpanches* were put in, as it was said there were two villages, but practically there is only one *abádi*, and there is no necessity whatever for two *sarpanches*, so I propose to reduce one office. The amount available for grant can be divided into three grants, two of Rs. 40 each and one of Rs. 42.

Zail Mansandwál.—The Bhadechi Jats predominate. In the following villages there are three or more headmen: Sarchur, Nasarki, Ghaniaki Bangar, Kotli Thapalán, Khaira, Qila Desa Singh, Lodi Nangal, Fattehgarh and Jangla. In Ghaniáki Bangar three chief headmen were put in, and though the number has since been reduced to two the system has worked very badly, and the headmen arrangements in this village are specially defective. I think one office should be reduced. In Jangla also there are two headmen, and here also one office can be reduced, as there is no special reason for its continuance, except that the village contain several classes of owners, and we might as well have had a *sarpanch* for each. In Qila Desa Singh two *sarpanches* were put in as there were two tribes. Both are Muhammadan Rájpúts, and the bad feeling is especially high. I should reduce altogether or cut down to one. The amount available for grant, Rs. 208, can be given in four *ináms* of Rs. 52 each. Deputy Commissioner has proposed abolition of office in Ghaniaki, and if so sanctioned, a further sum of Rs. 34, the *inám* of one chief headman retained, will be available for grant.

Zail Baddowál.—Randháwa Jats, Patháns and Rájpûts. In the following villages, where there are three or more headmen, the retention of the office is suggested: Kalu Afghánán, Chaudri Suja, Tega Kalán, Dádu Jahád, Hardorawál, Loháránwáli, Dogar, Jhinpán Kalán. In Hardorawál there were two *abádis*, and so two chief headmen were put in as there are two *abádis*. All are of same stock, and number of headmen is only two in one *abádi*, so one office should be reduced. In Murídki two chief headmen were also put in, as the owners were of different *gôts*. The arrangement has given rise to great squabbles, and the office here can be reduced as the village is unimportant. In Baddowál two *sarpanches* were also appointed, but there seems to have been some intention to have one for Hákim Beg, which is now a separate village, so the appointment is unnecessary; and owing to constant quarrels in the village the office should be altogether reduced. In Wila Teja two *sarpanches* were put in because one *taraf* is Randháwa and one Teja Jats. In this village especially the arrangements for headmen have worked very badly. Both *sarpanches* are dead, and the office should be reduced. The amount available for *ináms* can be divided into three *ináms*, one of Rs. 65 and two of Rs. 60 each.

Zail Shahpur Jajan.—Randháwás greatly predominate. In the following villages there are three or more headmen, and the appointment of *sarpanch* is retained: Bholeki, Talwandi Raman, Niko Sarai, Kuthiála, Shahpur Jajan, Padda, Udhowáli Kalán, Udhowáli Khurd, Gillanwáli, Basantkot, Abdal and Ratta. The amount available for grant can be divided into three *ináms* of Rs. 45, Rs. 45, and Rs. 47. In Raimal there are two headmen, and both are *sarpanches*. The offices should be reduced.

Zail Dehr.—Mixed Jats and Patháns. In the following villages there are three or more headmen and the retention of the office has been proposed. Sarwáli, Nangal Dalam, Fazalabad, Rái Chak, Chainewál, Mamman, Dargawál, Lhilwan, Shikar, Rausinke Talla, Dehr, Gawára, Rahimabad. In Kotli Surat Mallu, owing to the presence of an Aráin colony, a second *sarpanch* was appointed. Tahsíldár proposes total reduction of office to prevent discontent, and I agree. At any rate it should be reduced to one, as the Malhis own nearly the whole estate. Amount available to be divided into two *ináms* of Rs. 48 and Rs. 50.

Zail Singhpur.—Randháwa Jats predominate, but there are a good many Goraia and Mangal Jats. Retention of the *sarpanch* is proposed in the following villages, where there are three or more headmen: Shahpur Guraia, Bhagtána, Bohrwála, Samrái, Talwandi Goraia, Thetharke, Gholadhola, Puránawála, Gunián, Mangián, Mulowáli, Gur Chak, Ghaniake Bet. In Mansúr two chief headmen were appointed as there are two *abádis*, but I think one is quite enough, and so recommend the reduction of one office. Amount available for grant, Rs. 168, can be divided into three *ináms* of Rs. 55, Rs. 55 and Rs. 58.

LOUIS W. DANE,

Settlement Collector.

TAHSIL SHAKARGARH.

Zail Darmán.—In this *zail* the Tahsíldár has not recommended the retention of any chief headmen. I agree, as none of the villages have more than two headmen and the appointment of a chief headman is not required for any special local reasons except perhaps in Barri, Bhoi, Jarpál and Bhagwánpur. Rupees 164 are, therefore, available for *sofed-poshi* grants. Of the *zail*, the main tribes are Gahotars, Brahmans, Manhás and Gujars. The Zaildár, Fateh Singh, is a Manhás of Ghumíaula. There should be, I think three grants, two of Rs. 55 each and one of Rs. 54.

Zail Chak Nihála-Chajwál.—In this *zail* I would retain the chief headmen in the large and important villages of Barkhainan, Raisar Kalán, Delra, Bher, Natla Kalán, although, except in the case of Barkhainan and Chajwál, there are only two headmen in each. This reduces the amount available for grant to Rs. 213. Main tribes Kalál, Rájpúts and Gujars. Three *ináms* would be sufficient,—one of Rs. 83 and two of Rs. 65 each.

Zail Ramri.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of *sarpanch* in no village, but I think it is desirable to leave them in the following large estates: Sathiála, Barapind, Dudu Chak, Ramri, Malilan and Fathwál. This reduces the amount available for grant to Rs. 228, and this may be given in four *ináms*, two of Rs. 60 each, one of Rs. 55, and one of Rs. 53. Main tribes Salehria Rájpúts, Hindús and Muhammadans.

Zail Gumtála.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of *sarpanch* in Nadála, Agomanda, Mailu Sailu, Kála Chechi, Kallah, Bhattián Chaura, Gumtála. All of these are large estates with more than three headmen, so I concur. The main tribe is Munnan Gujars. The amount available might be given in three *ináms*,—two of Rs. 55 each and one of Rs. 57.

Zail Shakargarh.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of *sarpanch* in Muthi, Phalwári Jamwál. To these I would add Shakargarh, Khánowál, Hansowáli Jhangi, as they are important villages, though they have only two headmen. This reduces the available amount to Rs. 173, which can be given in three *ináms*—two of Rs. 60 each and one of Rs. 53. Main tribes Salehria Rájpúts with some Gujars.

Zail Sukho Chak.—Tahsíldár has only recommended retention of *sarpanch* in Japolota. I think, considering the size and importance of the villages, the office should be upheld in Sukho Chak, Chatrána, Chamál and Ratto Chak, Shahpur Jhango. This reduces amount available for *ináms* to Rs. 201, and this might be given in three *ináms* of Rs. 50 each and one of Rs. 51. The main tribe is the Lalotars.

Zail Masrúr.—Tahsíldár has recommended retention of chief headmen in Masrúr and Bagga, because there are three headmen in each. In the case of the former I do not think it is necessary, as the owners are few in number, and the leading man will probably always hold an *inám*. The amount available for grants is, therefore, Rs. 143, and one *inám* of Rs. 60, one of Rs. 43 and one of Rs. 40 might be given.

Zail Ikhláspur.—I think the *sarpanch* should be retained in Ikhláspur itself. This reduces the amount available for grants to Rs. 144. This can be given in two grants of Rs. 50 each and one of Rs. 44. The main tribe is the Sainís.

Zail Nainakot.—*Sarpanchi* retained in Beri Khurd, Tarpai, Sujowál, Hájipur Gujrán, Sárung Chak, Khadiál, which are all large villages with three or more headmen at present Main tribes Jaggi Rájpúts, Jats and miscellaneous. Amount available Rs. 199. Four *ináms* recommended,—three of Rs. 50 each and one of Rs. 49.

Zail Bhatti.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of *sarpanch* in Fatehpur, Chátri, Baruti, Dinpur Kalán, Mansura. I concur, as they are all considerable villages except perhaps Baruti. The main tribes are Gujars and Patháns. Amount available Rs. 155. Three *ináms* might be given, two of Rs. 50 each and one of Rs. 55.

Zail Báramanga.—Tahsíldár has recommended retention of the *sarpanch* in Pakrál, Jugiál, Kot Doába, Bissu Bazurg, Pindi Kalán and Chakri. All of these, except perhaps the last, are large and important villages with more than three headmen; so the office may be retained. Three *ináms* of Rs. 55 each are recommended out of the balance.

Zail Basankot.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of chief headmen in the following villages: Channi Tika, Jarmian Jhanda, Fathuni Chak, Basankot, Dalipur Bura, Dalla Nangal, Panwan Kokhar, Katta Kahlwán, Khánpur. They are all large villages, so I agree. I would also add Bhikho Chak and Dera Núr Malik, though there are less than three headmen in these. This leaves Rs. 117 available for grants. This should be divided into two grants,—one of Rs. 60 and one of Rs. 57. Main tribes are Kahlon Jats and Patháns.

Zail Ada.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of *sarpanch* in the following villages: Rúra, Bhopa, Ada, Gujar Tur, Ransnika, Pairewál, Pakhoki, Maddoki, Said Manjhla Gul, Buláki Chak, Miyádi Mattu Dáda. In Bhopa, Ransnika, Said Manjhla and Miyádi Mattu, which are unimportant villages, I do not consider that there is any necessity for this. The others are large estates. The amount available is, therefore, Rs. 47. One *inám* can be given.

Zail Mundi Khel.—Tahsíldár proposes to retain the *sarpanch* in Bustam Langah, Mundi Khel and Dera Afghánán, which are all large estates with more than three headmen. I concur. Two *ináms* can be given,—one of Rs. 50 and one of Rs. 32.

Zail Kanjúr Gurála.—Main tribes, Lalli Jats and Dat Brahman. Tahsíldár recommends retention of chief headmen in Gakka Kotli, Mirzewáli, Ghangrán and Manji Tor, as there are more than three headmen. I concur, though they are not very necessary. The amount available, Rs. 198, should be distributed over three *ináms*,—one of Rs. 98 and two of Rs. 50 each.

For the Rs. 98 I recommend Diwán Safa Chand of the Kanjrúr family if he resides at Kanjrúr. If ever put in as zaildár he should of course lose it.

Zail Ghadiála.—Tahsíldár recommends retention of *sarpanch* in Mandiála, Akeki, Malla, Fazalpura, and I think they should also be retained in Ghona, Ghadiála and Mengru. This leaves Rs. 112 available. The tribes here are much mixed, but Jats predominate. Two *ináms* of Rs. 55 and Rs. 57.

LOUIS W. DANE,

Settlement Collector.

TAHSIL PATHANKOT.

Zail Bambiál.—In this village the Manhás Rájpúts and Bains Jats predominate. There are four headmen in Bambiál, but elsewhere there are less than three; so the office may be reduced except in this village, which is large and important. The amount available for grant, Rs. 42, can be given as one *inám*.

Zail Kiri Khurd.—Tangral and Thakkar Rájpúts. In the following villages there are three and more headmen: Sihanti, Dalpat, Kharkhara and Jhambar. All of these are important estates close to and forming part of Narot, and the office can be maintained; elsewhere it can be reduced. The amount available for grant can be given in one *inám* Rs. 29.

Zail Kathlaur.—In this *zail* the Tangral Rájpúts predominate. There are two villages in which there are more than two headmen, Muthi and Soháwara Kalán; so the office may well be retained here, and the amount available for *inám* granted in one *inám* of Rs. 61.

Zail Gajju.—Salahrie Rájpúts and Gujars. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the chief headmen nowhere, but I think the office can be kept in Táragarh, which is a large and important village. In the following villages there are three or more headmen: Sharf Chak, Nangal Farída, Dalelpur, Adálatgarh, Sahâranpur, Balawar and Gandepindi, but they are all small unimportant villages, and it is not in any way necessary to keep up the office. In 24 villages out of 52 there are no chief headmen. The amount available can be given in two *ináms* of Rs. 50 and Rs. 46.

Zail Targarh.—Tarnach Brahmans are the leading tribes. In the following villages there are three or more headmen: Balsua, Gobindsar, Bhoya, Lahri Báwián, Narot Mahra Murádpur and Basrúp. Tahsíldár only proposed to retain the chief headmen in Narot and Bhoya. I think they should also remain in Balsua, Gobindsar, Lahri Báwián and Murádpur, which are important estates. In Basrúp there are only four owners, and it is not required. In 14 villages out of 39 there are no chief headmen. The amount available for grant, Rs. 140, can be given in three *ináms*,—two of Rs. 50 each and one of Rs. 40,—with special regard to services to be rendered in connection with the Bádshahi Nahr.

Zail Parmanand.—Harchand Rájpúts are the leading tribe. In the following villages there are three or more headmen: Saidipur, Tangu Shah, Pahâru Chak, Dala Bahin, Lahri Sarmun, Thakarpur, Mári, Danaur Dhobra, Katáru Chak and Parmanand. Tahsíldár proposes to retain the office only in the last, but I think it should also be retained in Katáru Chak and Dhobra, which are large villages. The others are very petty villages or are held by mixed tribes, and the retention of the office is undesirable. The amount available, Rs. 130, can be given in three *ináms*,—two of Rs. 45 each and one of Rs. 40. In 18 villages out of 55 there are no chief headmen.

Zail Gharota.—In this *zail* Gujars predominate and Manhás Rájpúts. On Sardúl Singh's death it will be divided between Parmanand and Mirthal. In the following villages there are three or more headmen: Chhanni Tola, Jangal, Chahan and Bagial. None of these, however, are important villages, and I think that the office should be reduced except in Chahan as proposed by Tahsíldár. The amount available for grant, Rs. 25, can be given as one *inám* on Sardúl Singh's death. Rupees 25 will go to Parmanand, which will raise the grants there to Rs. 130, which is sufficient for two *ináms* of Rs. 45 each and one of Rs. 40. In ten villages only there are chief headmen.

Zail Mirthal.—In this *zail* there are chief headmen only in Naushahra Nálbandán, Ghurota Khurd, Mirthal, Abádgarh, Kauntarpur, Ghiala Chohán, Lado Chak, but apparently the office should also exist in Nangalgurah and Papiál with reference to Mr. Roe's

paragraph 31, as there are more than one headman in each. The chief headmen get no *pachotra*, but in one or two instances held small *sasans*. In Naushahra Nálbandán, Chohán Gural and Lado Chak, which are large villages and have more than three headmen, the office should, I suppose, be retained. No *inám* available.

Zail Pathánkot.—A very mixed *zail* of some Jats and Rájpúts. In the following villages there are three or more headmen: Sujánpur, Bahlolpur, Bharoli Khurd, Sarna, Dehriwála, Daulatpur and Azízpur. Bharoli and Sarna are small estates, and there is no special reason for retaining the office, more especially in the latter, where the headmen have given a great deal of trouble. In Daulatpur the owners are partly Jats and partly Rájpúts, and so the retention of the post is undesirable. In Sujánpur, Azízpur and Dehriwála it may be retained. The amount available for grant is Rs. 85, which can be divided into two *ináms* of Rs. 40 and Rs. 45.

Zail Káhnpur.—Kohal Rájpúts predominate. Most of the estates here were included in the Shahpur Kandi circle; so the number of existing chief headmen is small, and the amount of *ináms* trifling. In Tharial Ranipur there are more than three headmen, and as they are large estates, the office may be maintained. In Ghol and Jugiál, where there are only two headmen, it might also be kept owing to the importance of the villages. Elsewhere it is hardly necessary, more especially as in most cases up to the present the chief headmen have received no remuneration. The amount available for grant is only Rs. 32, but Kanhaya, the zaildár of Káhnpur, receives a cash *inám* of Rs. 43 for life, and this might be released as part of the *sofed-poshi* grants, and two grants, one of Rs. 40 and one of Rs. 35,—might be given.

Zail Shahpur.—Thakkars are the main tribe here. The chief headmen heretofore received nothing, as all the estates were in the old Shahpur Kandi tract. In the following village there are three or more headmen, Thara, and the office can be retained, and it might also be retained in Kot Phangala, Hara, Tirhari, which are very large and important estates, and have two headmen. At present Diála of Dunera receives a pension of Rs. 150 a year, and the descendants of Jodh Singh of Bhamladeh have a small *jágír* of Rs. 75 net after deducting *nazarána*. If these two grants were maintained for *sofed-poshi ináms* on the death of the present incumbents we could give three grants, one of Rs. 100, one of Rs. 75 and one of Rs. 50; otherwise there is nothing available for grants.

LOUIS W. DANE,

Settlement Collector.

No. 116, dated 8th April 1892.

From—Colonel J. B. HUTCHINSON, Deputy Commissioner, Gurdáspur,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

WITH reference to your letter No. 110, dated 5th instant, asking for my opinion on Mr. Dane's letter No. 116, dated 29th March 1892, being his report on the question of the *ála-lambardári* system and proposed *ináms* in this district, I have the honor to reply as follows:—

2. I think it is a mistake to attempt to deal with the question of the *ála-lambardári* system in this district in the way proposed. The system should either be upheld in its entirety or altogether abolished. The system, I consider, is a bad one; it tends to create disputes and to engender bad feelings in every village in the district in which there are more than one lambardár, and my experience during the last three years in the district shows that there is no good result whatever from giving one lambardár a higher position in the village than the rest. The adna-lambardárs are inclined to throw all the work and responsibility on to the ála-lambardár, and he does not rise to this at all. He never renders more assistance because of his position, and certainly is never able to control the rest.

3. If, however, it is finally decided that the system must be upheld in some villages, *viz.*, those in which there are three or more lambardárs, or where the revenue is over Rs. 1,000 then I think it would be better to retain the system throughout the district as before than to have a mixed system of ála-lambardárs and inámdárs.

4. Mr. Dane has made his proposals in accordance with the directions given in the correspondence on the subject, and if this is to be followed, then I am of opinion that his proposals are the best possible, and should be accepted throughout. The appointment to post of inámdár should be made *zailwár*. In each *zail* a certain number of *ináms* should be fixed and the values determined. Appointments to these should be made as funds become available, and the appointments should be confined strictly to village headmen of that *zail* or to such other co-proprietors as may be accepted by the Commissioner under Rule 21 of the Rules under the Land Revenue Act.

I do not think that any alteration of the rules, as suggested by Mr. Dane in paragraph 8 of his letter, is necessary. If, in the opinion of the Collector, there is no headman fit for an *inám*, or that there is some co-proprietor who is more fit for it than any of

the lambardárs, then he can always obtain the sanction of the Commissioner under the rule quoted above.

5. The great advantage of introducing the system of *ináms zailwár* is that the inámdárs will be looked upon as assistant zaildárs who will be the natural candidates for the post of zaildár when it falls vacant, and they will be prominent men to whom the police can look for assistance in criminal work. As inámdárs too, it will be easily seen by their work whether they are men who are likely to make good zaildárs in the future.

6. I return Mr. Dane's original letter and the enclosures.

No. 115, dated Lahore, 27th June 1892.

From—E. B. Steedman, Esquire, Officiating Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I am directed to reply to your No. 320 of 5th May 1892 regarding the measures proposed for the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gurdáspur district.

2. The Financial Commissioner and the Commissioner agree in concurring throughout with the recommendations made by the Settlement Officer, Mr. Dane, and I am to say that Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick sanctions the proposals made, which are summarised below :—

(1). The proposals of the Settlement Officer for the abolition and retention of ála-lambardárs in each village.

(2). The disposal for each *zail* separately, and not for the district as a whole, of the *zamíndári ináms* that will be created by lapses of the *ála-lambardári ináms*.

(3). The extension of rules regarding *ináms* (Sections 27—29, Rules under the Land Revenue Act, Part II) to these *zamíndári ináms* and the consequent eligibility of headmen and other landowners for such *ináms*. The Financial Commissioner should submit a notification for publication.

(4). The resumption of cash *ináms* now enjoyed by ála-lambardárs appointed since 1st October 1888, whose appointments will cease on their death, and their utilisation in creating *zamíndári ináms*.

(5). The abolition of the *ála-lambardári* cess in any village in which the *ála-lambardári* ceases to exist. This cancels the orders contained in paragraph 4 of my letter No. 31 of 1st February 1890, that the cess will merge in the *malba*.

3. With reference to the opinion held by Mr. Young stated in the last paragraph of your letter, I am to say that the inclination of the Lieutenant-Governor is to agree with the Financial Commissioner, but Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick's experience of the working of the *ála-lambardári* system has been so very limited that he does not feel justified in reversing the decision of his predecessor on a point of which Sir James Lyall was so eminently competent a judge.

4. The rough English Register submitted by Mr. Dane is returned herewith in original.

Extract from *Punjab Government Gazette* Notification No. 139, dated the 13th of August 1892.

With reference to Rule 27 of Part II of the Rules under the Punjab Land Revenue Act (XVII of 1887), the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to extend and hereby extends Rules 28 and 29 of Part II of the Rules under the said Act relating to inámdárs to the Gurdáspur District.

Extracts from Final Settlement Report of the Gurdáspur District.

* * * * * *

Chief headmen.

In 1865 Mr. Prinsep, possibly with a view to counteract the disadvantages of having so many headmen, and possibly to reward deserving agriculturists, introduced what is known as the *ála-lambardári* system, the history of which has been given in the printed papers connected with letter No. 31, of 1st February 1890, from Junior Secretary to Government, Punjab. It was intended to appoint one headman to be the chief representative of the village, who was to be

called the chief headman, and was to receive one per cent. of the revenue of the estate, and one-tenth of the waste land for cultivation. Mr. Prinsep varied these instructions, and appointed chief headmen where there was only one headman, and in other villages two or even three chief headmen. He allotted one per cent. of the revenue to these officers, which in Shakargarh was deducted from the *khálsa* revenue, and in the three other tahsíls was collected by a cess in addition to the revenue. Besides this, he awarded culturable waste and, where this was not available, allotted cultivated common land or even private lands as *ináms*. The result was a loss of revenue of nearly two per cent. in addition to the one per cent. already referred to. In 1872, in Sháhpur Kandi also Mr. Roe put in chief headmen where there was more than one headman, but they received no dues. It devolved on the Settlement Officer of Gurdáspur to refer the whole question for orders, and it was eventually settled that the grant of common lands against the wishes of the owners could not be sustained, but that the existing chief headmen were to receive one per cent. on the revenue in the form of a cess, and also a cash grant out of the revenue, representing the revenue assessed on their former *ináms*, but not exceeding an additional one per cent.

A report was called for at the close of each settlement, showing where it was considered that the office could be reduced and the amount of the *ináms* resumed on account of the reduced offices is to be held available for the grant of agricultural *ináms* to leading headmen who have done well. The required report has been submitted, and the recommendations made in it are practically to the effect that the office should be reduced where there are less than three headmen, except in one or two very large and important estates, and where there are three or more headmen, the retention of a chief headman is suggested, unless previous experience has shown that, owing to differences of caste or religion, the office has caused serious disputes amongst the proprietors. The sum of Rs. 7,506 will eventually be available for *sofed-poshi* grants, and this has been distributed over two or three grants, in each *zail* ranging from Rs. 40 to Rs. 60 each.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

Chief lambardárs.

The *ála-lambardári* system, which is in force in this district, has also been thoroughly revised. As introduced by Mr. Prinsep, a chief headman was appointed in every village, however small, and in a few villages of Batála and Gurdáspur two such functionaries were appointed. The jealousies and dissensions thus caused among rival headmen in most villages far outweighed in their mischievous consequences any possible advantage to the district administration from having a selected principal headman in each village. The creation of such a post, too, in villages which only possess a single headman was an obvious absurdity. Difficulties arose also from the fact that most of these chief headmen had been granted assignments of the revenue on assessed lands, or plots of unassessed village common lands for cultivation, in addition to their cash emoluments. The local officers were in favour of the total abolition of the system as an unnecessary and troublesome agency, but this was not agreed to by Government. The Settlement Officer was, however, allowed to prepare a scheme for the gradual abolition of the office of chief lambardár, as existing incumbents died out, in villages having less than three headmen, unless there were any special reasons for the retention of a chief headman in any such villages. The system was to be ordinarily retained in villages having three or more headmen, unless there was any special reason for its abolition. Mr. Dane submitted proposals accordingly, which have received the approval of Government. The result is that the office of chief headman will gradually be abolished in all except 342 villages of the district.

The *ála-lambardári máfis* have been resumed, and in lieu cash *ináms*, up to a maximum of one per cent. on the revenue, have been allowed to the former recipients of such *máfi* grants. Where the *ála-lambardári* system is being abolished these *ináms* will be utilized, as they fall in, as a fund for the provision of a few *sofed-poshi ináms* in each *zail* for selected headmen or other land owners.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE AMRITSAR DISTRICT.

No. 687, dated Lahore, 21st July 1893.

From—J. R. Maconachie, Esquire, Offg. Commr. and Supdt., Lahore Division,

To—M. W. Fenton, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I have the honor to forward, for the orders of the Financial Commissioner, copy of No. 356 of 3rd July, from the Settlement Collector of Amritsar, submitting proposals for arrangements as to ála-lambardárs and the remuneration of inámdárs from the proceeds of the partial resumption to be made of the *ála-lambardári* cess.

2. The detailed statement accompanying Mr. Grant's letter shows the results in figures, and the rules he proposes for obtaining such results appear harmonious with, and subsidiary to, those already promulgated by Government.

3. On two points, I confess, I should wish to see great latitude allowed, *viz.*, that inámdárs might, in appropriate cases, be other than headmen, and secondly, that the distribution of *ináms* need not strictly be made *zailwár*. On looking back through the correspondence, I see that Colonel Hutchinson, as Deputy Commissioner of Gurdáspur, remarked that the great advantage of having the *ináms zailwár* was that the holders would be as it were assistants to the zaildár, and might be looked on as the coming candidates for the post. I doubt whether practical experience will support this; but there is another ground for seeking some latitude in the appointment of inámdárs, *viz.*, that we are thus enabled to recognise, at very little expense, the local sentiment of respect entertained in the country-side for members of old families, who without doing any very active service to Government just now, and without being personally eligible for zaildárships, are nevertheless respectable and quiet representatives of traditional names, for which it is well to show some regard. The same reasoning applies to appointments made of others than village headmen. The *sofed-posh* class who have already stamped their names locally on the proposed *ináms* are by no means always headmen.

4. If the fact of Government having given its ruling on these points as regards arrangements in another district precludes further discussion, I recommend Mr. Grant's proposals for sanction throughout.

Copy of a letter No. 356, dated 3rd July 1893, from J. A. Grant, Esquire, Settlement Collector, Amritsar, to G. M. Ogilvie, Esquire, Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I have the honor to submit proposals regarding ála-lambardárs in the Amritsar and Tarn Táran tahsíls of the district. Proposals regarding the Ajnála tahsíl will follow when the new *kishtbandi* is ready.

The proposed arrangements are on the lines already approved by Government for the Gujrát district and for all other districts settled under Mr. Prinsep's supervision (paragraph 7 of Punjab Government No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893). As each tahsíl was re-assessed the ála-lambardárs' *máfis* were resumed and in their place cash *ináms* were fixed. In a few villages there is no *inám* for the ála-lambardár because his *inám* was to coincide with the revenue which, in ordinary course, was assessed on the *máfi* land, and where the latter was unculturable there was no assessment.

I have drawn up the following rules for the future treatment of ála-lambardárs' *ináms* and cess, and providing for the gradual extinction of the office in cases where it has been admitted it is no longer desirable to retain it.

I.—Where there is only one lambardár the post of *sarpanch* shall be abolished on the death or dismissal of the existing incumbent.

II.—Where there are only two lambardárs, both of whom are *sarpanches*, the post of each existing *sarpanch* shall be abolished on his death or dismissal.

III.—But if in any village there are three or more lambardárs, only one of whom is *sarpanch*, the post of the latter shall be retained.

IV.—Where there are three or more lambardárs and there is more than one *sarpanch*, the post of only one selected *sarpanch* shall be retained, and the post of each other *sarpanch* shall be abolished on the death or dismissal of the existing incumbent.

V.—Where the office of *sarpanch* is totally abolished under Rule I or Rule II, the cess of one per cent. will cease to be levied in the village with effect from the harvest during which the final extinction of the office took place.

VI.—Wherever the office of *sarpanch* is to be partially abolished under Rule IV the cess shall continue to be levied in full for the joint benefit of all existing *sarpanches* until only the *sarpanch* selected for retention remains. After that it shall continue to be levied for the benefit of him and his successors in office.

VII.—The *sarpanchi ináms* which have been substituted for *sarpanchi máfís*, in accordance with the orders contained in Punjab Government letter No. 30, dated 1st February 1890, will continue to be enjoyed by all *sarpanches* for the time being.

VIII.—Upon the abolition of the office of a *sarpanch* in any *zail*, the equivalent of the *inám* of the post will be at the disposal of the Collector, for bestowal on a village headman, residing in the *zail*, to be selected by the Collector.

IX.—Nothing will be granted in this way to any *zamíndári* inámdár, except as against an equivalent previous lapse to Government within the *zail* of a *sarpanchi inám*.

X.—The *inám* of a *zamíndári* inámdár may be increased by the Collector from time to time as *sarpanchi ináms* fall in within the *zail*, up to a maximum of Rs. 40 per annum. With the sanction of the Commissioner this may be increased to Rs. 80.

There is nothing in any of the above rules which has not already been approved of by Government in the case of the Gujrát district.

I need not give detailed lists of the villages in which the office will, or will not, be abolished. These will be furnished to the Deputy Commissioner when orders are received on this reference. A summary of the results which will follow on these proposals is, however, given in the form of a statement for each tahsíl, which shows that the sum which will become available is Rs. 1,687 in the Amritsar tahsíl, and Rs. 1,133 in the Tarn Táran tahsíl (column 4 of statement, plus column 7).

TAHSIL AMRITSAR.

Statement showing the result of proposals to partially abolish the post of ála-lambardár.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		Less than 3 lambardárs and office will be wholly abolished.		*Three or more lambardárs and office will be partially abolished, one ála-lambardár only being retained.*			*Three or more lambardárs with only one ála-lambardár. No abolition of office proposed.*			
Tahsíl.	Zail.	Villages.	Amount of *inám* to be resumed.	Villages.	Amount of *inám* to be retained.	Amount to be resumed.	Villages.	Amount of *inám*.	Villages in which there is an ála-lambardár but no *inám*.	Villages in which there is no ála-lambardár at all.
			Rs.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.		Rs.		
AMRITSAR.	Chimi Bath ...	14	88	...	...	...	16	169	...	...
	Sheron	14	87	1	14 0 0	21 0 0	2	27	...	...
	Batála	9	38	2	38 8 0	31 8 0	9	92	1	...
	Mahta	10	60	4	40 8 0	34 8 0	8	131	...	...
	Mattewál	28	204	...	...	...	8	129	2	...
	Tarsikka	17	120	...	...	...	10	148	1	...
	Malbián	6	43	2	36 0 0	19 0 0	13	200	1	...
	Bondála	11	71	2	43 0 0	15 0 0	7	107	2	3
	Fatipur	12	84	3	30 0 0	19 0 0	10	188	...	...
	Kathunangal ...	32	239	...	...	...	10	164	1	...
	Tarpai	20	149	2	17 0 0	12 0 0	5	80	1	2
	Majítha	8	71	2	30 0 0	23 0 0	8	175	1	...
	Mírankot	9	62	1	16 0 0	11 0 0	9	171	...	...
	Gilwáli	11	95	4	39 0 0	25 0 0	12	204	...	...
	Amritsar	1	30	2	40 0 0	35 0 0	6	144	...	2
	Total ...	202	1,441	25	344 0 0	246 0 0	133	2,129	10	7

TAHSIL TARN TARAN.

Statement showing result of proposals to partially abolish the post of ála-lambardár.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		One ála-lambardár and less than three lambardárs' office will be wholly abolished.		*Three or more lambardárs with more than one ála-lambardár office will be partially abolished, one ála lambardár only being retained.*			*Three or more lambardárs with only one ála-lambardár, no abolition of office proposed.*		Villages in which there is an ála-lambardár but no inám.	Villages in which there is no ála-lambardár at all.
Tahsil.	Zail.	Villages.	Amount of inám to be resumed.	Villages.	Portion of inám to be retained.	Portion of inám to be resumed.	Villages.	Amount of inám.		
			Rs.		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.		
TARN TARAN.	Atári	10	86	1	7	7	5	40	2	1
	Bhakna	15	114	...	...	...	3	44	1	...
	Dhand	6	36	3	48	25	4	68	...	...
	Tarn Táran ...	12	84	1	6	8	14	151	...	...
	Rasúlpur ...	19	87	...	...	...	9	98	1	1
	Kang	8	65	2	20	17	6	78	...	2
	Nagoki	5	26	1	14	7	10	122	...	...
	Jelálabad ...	16	73	...	...	...	9	107	3	1
	Vairowál... ...	18	85	...	...	...	3	34	3	2
	Jamerai	6	38	...	...	...	7	62	1	...
	Rániwála ...	2	24	1	8	3	9	71	2	...
	Sirháli	15	51	1	11	5	9	65	...	2
	Naushera Pummán	16	59	...	...	...	13	127	...	...
	Padri	21	99	...	...	...	12	108	1	...
	Parywar	7	40	1	7	7	14	188	...	1
	Naushera Dhala	11	82	1	8	5	3	42	2	1
	Total ...	187	1,049	12	124	84	130	1,405	16	11

No. 5199, dated 16th August 1893.

From—M. W. FENTON, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 687, dated 21st July 1893, regarding the *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the Amritsar and Tarn Táran tahsíls of the Amritsar district, and, in reply, to convey the sanction of the Financial Commissioner to the rules proposed by Mr. Grant.

C. M. RIVAZ, Esquire, C.S.

2. The result of the arrangements now sanctioned is that the *ála-lambardári* system will be retained in a considerably larger proportion of villages in these two tahsíls of the Amritsar district than it has been in the Gurdáspur or Lahore districts, but Mr. Grant has followed the Government orders in the matter.

3. As regards the two points raised in your letter, the question of making the new *zamíndári ináms zailwár* was considered and decided in the Gurdáspur case, and the same reasons apply in the present instance. And as regards the proposal that land owners other than lambardárs shall be in special cases eligible for an *inám*, you seem to have overlooked that this is already provided for in Rule 166, which will apply when the *inám* rules are extended to Amritsar. This question, too, was noticed in the Gurdáspur case (paragraph 2 (3) of Punjab Government No. 115, dated 27th June 1892), and no further special provision is necessary in the matter.

4. An application has been made to Government for the extension of the *inám* rules under the Land Revenue Act to the Amritsar district.

No. 507, dated Lahore, 16th August 1893.

From—M. W. FENTON, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

I AM directed to forward, for the information of Government, a copy of a set of rules framed by the Settlement Officer, Amritsar, relating to *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the Amritsar and Tarn Táran tahsíls of the Amritsar district, and to say that

C. M. RIVAZ, Esquire, C.S.

they have been sanctioned by the Financial Commissioner in accordance with the authority in this behalf conveyed in paragraph 7 of Mr. Thomson's letter No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893.

2. In consequence of the introduction of the system of *zamíndari ináms* contemplated by the rules, it will be necessary to extend to the Amritsar District Rules 173 and 174 of the Rules under the Land Revenue Act, and a draft notification is submitted accordingly.

Ala-lambardári Rules, Amritsar and Tarn Táran Tahsíls.

I.—Where there is only one lambardár the post of *sarpanch* shall be abolished on the death or dismissal of the existing incumbent.

II.—Where there are only two lambardárs, both of whom are *sarpanches*, the post of each existing *sarpanch* shall be abolished on his death or dismissal.

III.—But if in any village there are three or more lambardárs, only one of whom is *sarpanch*, the post of the latter shall be retained.

IV.—Where there are three or more lambardárs and there is more than one *sarpanch*, the post of only one selected *sarpanch* shall be retained, and the post of each other *sarpanch* shall be abolished on the death or dismissal of the existing incumbent.

V.—Where the office of *sarpanch* is totally abolished under Rule I or Rule II, the cess of one per cent. will cease to be levied in the village with effect from the harvest during which the final extinction of the office took place.

VI.—Wherever the office of *sarpanch* is to be partially abolished under Rule IV, the cess shall continue to be levied in full for the joint benefit of all existing *sarpanches* until only the *sarpanch* selected for retention remains. After that it shall continue to be levied for the benefit of him and his successors in office.

VII.—The *sarpanchi ináms* which have been substituted for *sarpanchi máfís*, in accordance with the orders contained in Punjab Government letter No. 30, dated 1st February 1890, will continue to be enjoyed by all *sarpanches* for the time being.

VIII.—Upon the abolition of the office of a *sarpanch* in any *zail*, the equivalent of the *inám* of the post will be at the disposal of the Collector, for bestowal on a village headman, residing in the *zail*, to be selected by the Collector.

IX.—Nothing will be granted in this way to any *zamíndári* inámdár, except as against an equivalent previous lapse to Government within the *zail* of a *sarpanchi inám*.

X.—The *inám* of a *zamíndári* inámdár may be increased by the Collector from time to time as *sarpanchi ináms* fall in, within the *zail*, up to a maximum of Rs. 40 per annum. With the sanction of the Commissioner this may be increased to Rs. 80.

Dated 29th August 1893.

No. 151.—*Notification*—With reference to Rule 172 of the Rules under the Punjab Land Revenue Act (XVII of 1887), the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to extend, and hereby extends, Rules 173 and 174 of the Rules under the said Act relating to inámdárs to the Amritsar District.

No. 152, dated 29th August 1893.

Copy forwarded to the Senior Secretary to the Financial Commissioners, Punjab, with reference to his letter No. 507, dated 16th August 1893.

No. 5624, dated 8th September 1893.

Endorsement by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

Copy of Punjab Government No. 152, dated 29th August 1893, with copy of Financial Commissioner's No. 507, dated 16th idem, forwarded in continuation of this office No. 5199, dated 16th August 1893, for information.

Copy of a letter No. 535, dated 2nd September 1893, from Settlement Officer, Amritsar, to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

With my letter No. 356 I submitted a draft of rules to be used in dealing with the ála-lambardárs' cess and *ináms* of the Amritsar and Tarn Táran tahsíls. These were approved, as they stood, by the Financial Commissioner, *vide*, his Secretary's letter No. 5199 of the 16th August 1893 and your endorsement No. 893 of the 21st idem.

2. I now forward a statement showing the result of applying these same rules to the *ála-lambardári ináms* of the Ajnála tahsíl. *Ináms* to the value of Rs. 1,131, columns 4 and 7, will be gradually resumed and devoted to founding *sofed-poshi ináms zailwár* while *ináms* to the value of Rs. 1,125, columns 6 and 9, will continue to be enjoyed by ála-lambardárs for the term of settlement.

3. I have already submitted a draft of a notification extending the *inám* rules under the Land Revenue Act to the Amritsar district, and it has appeared as No. 151 of the *Panjab Gazette* of 31st August 1893.

4. I now request sanction to the application of my rules to the Ajnála tahsil.

TAHSIL AJNALA.

Statement showing results of proposals to partially abolish the post of ála-lambardár,

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		Less than three lambardárs and office of lambardár will be wholly abolished.		*Three or more lambardárs with more than one, and office will be partially abolished, one ála-lambardár being retained.*			*Three or more lambardárs with only one ála-lambardár. No abolition of office proposed.*			
Tahsil.	Zail.	Villages.	Amount of *inám* to be resumed.	Villages.	Amount of *inám* to be retained.	Amount to be resumed.	Villages.	Amount of *inám*.	Villages in which there is an ála-lambardár and no *inám*.	Villages in which there is no ála-lambardár at all.
Ajnála.	Kamálpur ...	17	101	2	14	12	8	59	3	1
	Sadhar	20	116	1	8	8	10	100	1	...
	Malikpur ...	14	68	1	7	4	6	53	7	2
	Ballarhwál ...	23	104	...	...	...	3	25	6	1
	Ajnála	17	88	3	32	23	4	51	1	...
	Sainsra	8	54	1	3	3	11	192	2	...
	Rája Sánsi ...	10	71	1	9	6	5	84	5	2
	Karial	13	76	1	14	9	9	81	4	1
	Bhindi Aulakh ...	24	64	1	5	5	5	61	7	...
	Bhilowál ...	15	81	3	20	14	6	54	1	...
	Lopoki ...	18	82	2	25	11	6	82	2	...
	Kohála ...	15	107	2	26	24	9	120	2	...
	Total ...	194	1,012	18	163	119	82	962	41	7

No. 841, dated 11th September 1893.

Endorsement by the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

Copy, with enclosure, forwarded to the Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, for favor of submission to Government, for sanction to Mr. Grant's proposal.

No. 5914, dated 21st September 1893.

From—M. W. Fenton, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

In reply to your No. 841, dated 11th instant, I am directed to say that the Financial Commissioner sanctions the extension to the Ajnála tahsíl of the rules relating to *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the Amritsar and Tarn Táran tahsíls.

C. M. Rivaz, Esquire, C.S.

Extracts from the Final Settlement Report of the Amritsar District.

Appointment of ála-lambardárs in 1865.

134. Chief headmen were appointed in all villages at the revised settlement of 1865. This was done in all the districts settled under the supervision of Mr. Prinsep, under the authority of Punjab Government letter No. 1005, dated 29th October 1864. That letter directed that one per cent. of the revenue should be set aside for the remuneration of the chief headmen and for *ináms*, that one-tenth of the produce of jungle or uncultivated waste should be distributed to the chief headmen, and that one-tenth of the proceeds of all land brought under cultivation during the term of settlement by their exertions should also be assigned to them.

Máfis allotted to them in 1865.

135. What was actually done was not however in conformity with these instructions. A cess of one per cent. on the revenue was levied for the benefit of the chief headman over and above the 5 per cent. or *pachotra* taken by the headmen. A vernacular proceeding was drawn up for each estate, in which it was set out that the proprietary body agreed to set aside a portion of the common culturable waste as the remuneration of the chief headman, and of this he took possession. If there was no waste common to all, a plot was chosen out of the waste, owned by a sub-division of the village, or even, in a few cases, by an individual owner who had land to spare. It is doubtful whether in all cases the owners fully understood what was being done, and whether they all gave their unqualified assent. The assessment of the land so set aside was fixed, and it was recorded that this should be considered as remitted in favour of the chief headmen for the time being. The plot was known as the ála-lambardár's *máfi*.

136. The chief headman was sometimes chosen by acclamation, sometimes by votes of the proprietors, or of the other lambardárs and sometimes where claims were equal, lots were drawn. In some villages two headmen were appointed, one to represent each major sub-division, or one to represent the Hindu, the other the Muhammadan proprietors. Even where there was only one headman he was usually appointed chief headman. Where there were only two headmen it occasionally happened that they were both nominated as chief headmen, and in some large villages even three chief headmen were appointed.

Ála-lambardárs how appointed.

137. In 1888 much correspondence took place on the subject, District and Settlement Officers being almost unanimous in advocating the total abolition of the system as having failed to produce good results, and being even a source of dispute and heart-burning, which it would be well to put an end to.

Abolition of the office proposed and negatived.

The orders of Government are contained in letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890. As to the *máfís*, it was ordered that they should be resumed, and thatcash *ináms* out of the revenue of the village, should be given to the chief headman instead, the value of which should be equal to the sum which would be imposed on the *máfi* plot according to the method adopted by the people in distributing their revenue. If, however, the *inám* by this process proved to be more than one per cent. on the revenue of the village, it was to be reduced down to that maximum. The Lieutenant-Governor refused to sanction, then and there, the abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system, but directed that when the final report of each settlement in progress came to be written, the subject should be mentioned and proposals for the total or partial abolition of the system would be considered.

138. Accordingly, with effect from the date on which the new assessment of each tahsíl took effect, ála-lambardárs' *máfís* have been all resumed, and the land of each *máfi* plot has been brought into the assessable area; cash *ináms*, calculated according to the method laid down, have been awarded instead. In 18 estates there is no ála-lambardár. In 67 estates there is an ála-lambardár but he enjoys no *inám* for the *máfi* plot, being] waste and uncultivated, had no portion of the village assessment put upon it by the people in internal distribution. With regard to the remaining estates, in which there are ála-lambardárs, enjoying *ináms*, it was not necessary to submit any special report, for on receipt of the report from the Gujrát District, Government approved of a system for dealing with these appointments, which was prescribed for adoption in all other districts settled by Mr. Prinsep, for which no special orders regarding ála-lambardárs had already been passed. All that was necessary in Amritsar was to draw up and submit for sanction a set of rules embodying the principles approved by Government, and to show in the form of a statement the effect of applying these rules to the district.

Ináms now substituted *máfís*.

139. Briefly, the scheme provides that in villages which have only one, or only two headmen, the office of ála-lambardár shall be abolished on the death of the existing incumbent, after which the one per cent. cess shall cease to be levied, and the *inám* shall cease to be enjoyed. In all villages where there are two chief headmen and more than two lambardárs, the office of one of them is, on his death, to be abolished in the same way. In all other villages having more than two headmen but only one ála-lambardár, the office is not to be interfered with during the term of settlement. The sums made available by the gradual lapse of deceased chief headmen's *ináms* are not to be credited to Government, but utilized in founding special *sofed-poshi ináms* to be granted to deserving village notables, selected by the Deputy Commissioner within the *zail* in which the lapse takes place. The maximum amount of *inám* to be enjoyed by these notables has been fixed at Rs. 40.

Gradual extinction of the office in small villages permitted.

The rules were approved by the Financial Commissioner in his Secretary's letter No. 5199, dated 16th August 1893. The *inám* rules under the Land Revenue Act were thereupon extended to the Amritsar District by Notification No. 151, published in the *Gazette* of 31st August 1893. A copy of the rules and list of the *ála-lambardári ináms* of each *zail* has been made over to the Deputy Commissioner, showing which will be resumed and which will be retained. The totals are as follows :—

Tahsíl.	Value of *ináms* to be gradually resumed as they lapse.	Value of *ináms* to be retained for term of settlement.	Total.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Amritsar	1,687	2,473	4,160
Tarn Táran	1,133	1,529	2,662
Ajnála	1,131	1,125	2,256
Total	3,951	5,127	9,078

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE LAHORE DISTRICT.

No. 595, dated Lahore, 19th June 1893.

From—G. M. OGILVIE, Esquire, Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

1. Settlement Collector to Commissioner, No. 72, dated 4th May 1893, with enclosures in original.
2. Settlement Collector to Commissioner, No. 76 dated 4th May 1893.
3. Settlement Collector to Commissioner, No. 73, dated 4th May 1893, with enclosures in original.

I HAVE the honour to forward copies of three letters of the Settlement Collector, Lahore, noted in the margin, for the consideration of the Financial Commissioner. The two first letters contain the Settlement Collector's proposals in reference to the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system, in accordance with existing orders; and the last letter contains his report on the arrangement of *zails* in the Lahore District. These two subjects are intimately connected by the Settlement Collector's treatment of them, and consequently it is necessary to consider his proposals in reference to both subjects together.

First proposal. Partial retention of *lambardári* system.

2. It is proposed to retain the *ála-lambardári* system in only 78 villages in the district, a number equal to 5 per cent. of the whole. I observe that the local circumstances of districts vary; there are peculiar difficulties in Lahore, as explained by the Settlement Collector, and the principles adopted in any other district, may, very possibly, be found unsuitable to Lahore. The arrangements made in the Gujrát District have been prescribed by Government as a model for similar proceedings in other districts as far as possible. But I think that the Settlement Collector has shown good reasons why the Gujrát system should be greatly modified in application to the Lahore District. The small percentage of villages in which it is proposed to retain the *ála-lambardári* system will in itself be no cause for regret. The system is not satisfactory, and is unanimously condemned by all officers who have experience of its working. The proposals of the Settlement Collector tend to restrict the system within as narrow limits as is permissible in regard to the orders of Government on the subject. The selection of villages in which the system is to be maintained has been made by the Settlement Collector from his own local knowledge; and I think that his judgment on this point may be entirely relied on. I accordingly recommend these proposals for sanction.

Punjab Government letter to Financial Commissioner, No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893, paragraph 7.

Second proposal. Disposal of *ála-lambardári inâms*. Preliminary point.

3 The second proposal refers to the disposal of *ála-lambardári ináms*. A preliminary point under this head is, as to whether these *ináms* should be assinged to some one *at once*, when they become available by the death of an ála-lambardár whose post is not to be continued, or, whether they should not be so assigned when too small in amount for an ordinary *zamíndári inám*, but should be suspended until such time as the aggregate of such small lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms* reaches a figure sufficiently large for assignment as a *zamíndári inám*. I hope that I have made this point clear. My own opinion is in favour of the latter of the two courses above indicated; and, if I rightly understand the Settlement Collector's meaning, he is of the same opinion. He writes: "It would be better, for many reasons, to wait until the lapsed *ináms* have reached a respectable sum, say, not less than 40 or 50 rupees, and *then only* appoint an inámkhor to receive an *inám* of fixed amount."

Paragraph 8 of Settlement Collector's letter No. 72, dated 4th May 1893.

Proposal regarding *ináms* to zaildárs.

4 Passing by this preliminary point, the Settlement Collector proposes that some of the *ináms*, rendered available by the lapse of *ála-lambardári ináms*, shall be assigned to zaildárs to increase the income derived from the one per cent. drawback on the revenue, when this amount is found insufficient in any *zail* for the remuneration of the zaildar. In this connection reference should be made to the last of the three letters, copies of which are herewith submitted. Ordinary proposals for the re-organization of *zails* can be sanctioned by a Commissioner. The proposals now made for the Lahore District, however, require, in my opinion, very careful revision. I would not be disposed to sanction them in their present form. But the Settlement Collector's report is now submitted for the Financial Commissioner's consideration, *not* in reference to the general suitableness of these proposals, but for decision of the question whether, as a matter of principle, it is permissible to increase the income of zaildárs when found insufficient by assignment of *ináms* in addition to the income derived from the one per cent. drawback on the revenue of the *zail*. I think that it is quite conceivable that there may sometimes be very strong reasons for forming a *zail* out of a collection of villages the revenue of which would not be sufficiently large to furnish a proper income for the zaildár at the sanctioned percentage. In such a case I can see no objection to the assignment of a cash *inám* to the zaildár of amount sufficient

to bring up his income to the requisite standard. On the point of principle, therefore, I agree with the Settlement Officer, though I cannot at present recommend for sanction his detailed proposals for the reconstruction of *zails*.

Question regarding lapsed *zamíndári ináms* in the Lahore District.

5. There is another point mentioned by the Settlement Collector in this connection, regarding which orders are required. The point is as to whether existing *zamíndári ináms* in Lahore are to be treated in the same way as *ála-lambardári ináms* in places where the *ála-lambardári* system is abolished. Reference should be made to letter of Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, to Commissioner, Lahore, No. 2907, dated 2nd May 1891. It seems to me that the orders of Government regarding lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms* do *not* cover the case of ordinary *zamíndári ináms*. The Settlement Collector has assumed, on the strength of the letter above quoted, that ordinary *zamíndári ináms* are, on lapse by the death of the holder, to be treated in the same way as lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms*. This view appears sustainable on the authority quoted; but I must leave the Financial Commissioner to decide whether the orders of Government ought to be taken on the point or not.

Third proposal. Abolition of *ála-lambardári* in Sharakpur Tahsíl.

6. The third proposal of the Settlement Collector is that in the Sharakpur Tahsíl the *ala-lambardári* system shall be immediately abolished without waiting for the decease of existing incumbents, except in the villages in which it is to be permanently retained. He gives reasons for this proposal, and my own opinion is in favour of it. But it is contrary to the existing orders of Government on this point, and the question is whether Government will see fit to make an exception to the general rule, for special reasons, in the Sharakpur Tahsíl.

Fourth proposal. Disposal of *ála-lambardári* cess.

7. The fourth and last proposal of the Settlement Collector is a very important one and has reference to the *ala-lambardári* cess. The proposal is that the *ala-lambardári* cess shall continue to be levied throughout the Lahore District; in places where ala-lambardárs are retained, the proceeds of the cess will, of course, go to the ala-lambardárs, but where the system is abolished it is proposed that the proceeds of the cess shall be credited as an increment to the Patwári Fund. This proposal is opposed to the existing orders of Government, according to which the cess is to be abolished in all places in which the *ala lambardári* system ceases to exist. The scheme of the Settlement Collector for the arrangement of the Patwári service in the Lahore District has been forwarded separately to the Director of Land Records with this office letter No. 641 of the 15th instant. In that report the necessity for providing some increase to the Patwári Fund in the Lahore District is fully explained. In the letters, copies of which are herewith submitted, the Settlement Collector advances other arguments in favour of his proposal. He says that the cess has been actually *báchhed* everywhere, except in 77 estates, and he also argues that it is an anomaly to levy a cess in some estates, that is, in those where the *ala-lambardári* system is to be retained, and not in others. This latter argument does not appear to me of much weight. The estates which pay the cess at least get their ala-lambardár, although they do not appreciate that privilege. But it has been shown in the separate report on this subject abovementioned, that if this proposal were accepted two of the Lahore tahsíls would be paying for the Patwári service in the other two tahsíls, there being four tahsíls in the district. Besides this objection, I much doubt whether Government will be disposed to reverse in Lahore the principle which has been elsewhere affirmed, or will approve of appropriating a cess to an object for which it was never intended. I have not to decide the question, but only to record an opinion. I do not recommend this proposal for sanction, but I agree with the Settlement Collector in thinking that the provision of some increase to the Patwári Fund in Lahore, in some way or other, is unavoidable.

Letter of Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab, to Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, No. 115, dated 27th June 1892, paragraph 2, clause 5.

The anomaly rather is in retaining a partial *ála-lambardári* system.
C. M. R.

Certainly not.
C. M. R.

No. 72, dated 4th May 1893.

From—G. C. WALKER, Esquire, Settlement Officer, Lahore,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I have the honour to report on the subject of the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Lahore District, in the manner prescribed in paragraph 2 of Punjab Government letter No. 86, dated 19th October 1891.

2. Under paragraph 6 of Punjab Government letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890, it was left open to any Settlement Officer to make any representation on any part of the subject of the ála-lambardár system which he might think should receive the further consideration and orders of Government.

3. Since the issue of that letter orders have been passed on the subject as regards the district of Gurdáspur. Mr. Dane's proposals, based, as he says in paragraph 4 of

his letter No. 116, on the general principle of retaining the post where there were three or more headmen, and reducing it where there were less, were sanctioned by Punjab Government letter No. 115 of 27th June 1892. The result of those orders was to retain the post in only 14 per cent. of the total number of villages in the Gurdáspur District.

4. Following the principles there established by precedent, I have been trying to frame proposals for this district, the effect of which, omitting exceptional cases, was to abolish the post in all villages where the number of lambardárs is less than three, or the revenue is less than Rs. 1,000, and to retain it in all others. Unfortunately, this basis led to somewhat anomalous results. There are a considerable number of large villages in this district paying over Rs. 1,000 revenue, or even over Rs. 2,000, but they have not more than two lambardárs. On the other side there are not a few villages in which the revenue is less than Rs. 1,000, but the number of lambardárs is three or more. This should be capable of remedy by increasing and decreasing the number of lambardárs: but to increase is seldom desirable in the interest of the administration, and to decrease is somewhat opposed to the spirit of existing orders.

5. Finding the above principle would not stand examination, I have sought about carefully for other grounds for any sort of consistent proposals I could bring forward in compliance with the orders for *partially* abolishing the ála-lambardár system. I have consulted the people, but they don't help me: their answer is, usually, that the *ála-lambardári* is a creation of Government for which the Government should pay; he does no good to them, and they don't see why their cesses should be increased on his account. I have consulted all my subordinates, and they prefer to regard the present position of the question as an excellent opportunity of rewarding or punishing ála-lambardárs, according to their services, during the past settlement. This is hardly a broad enough view of the matter.

6. The only satisfactory method of coming to any conclusion on the question is to consider the conditions of each village separately. The best general theory to work upon appears to be that all large villages which have an unwieldy number of lambardárs, not always certain to work together in concert, should be provided with ála-lambardárs. On the other hand, most of the larger villages are in the Mánja, and consist of powerful communities of Sindhu or Bhullar or Dhilwan Játs, who recognize little authority in their lambardárs, and still less in the *ála*. When these Játs are all of one clan, the post really is totally unnecessary and useless, except when the number of lambardárs is so large as to be incapable of co-operation for Government purposes. Such a number might, perhaps, be taken at six or more, though I don't feel able to give any special reason for taking that number. On the other hand, if the settlement includes other miscellaneous castes, particularly of the money-lending classes, it may be advisable, in the interests both of the administration and of the agricultural shareholders themselves, to have one of the latter as chief representative of the village. I have, on these principles, selected from the whole district 78 villages in which the retention of the post is proposed. A list of the selected villages, with such details as appear necessary, is append-to this Report.

7. Where the office is to be abolished, I presume that the absorption will be gradual, and that no inámkhorships will be created until sufficent *ala-lambardári ináms* have lapsed to provide funds. But in Sharakpur, where most of the villages are small and poor, and where the utility of the office of ala-lambardár is even more open to doubt than elsewhere, I should prefer to see a different policy pursued. It would here certainly be far more convenient, and, so far as I can see, no harm to abolish the post straight away in all villages in which it is not to be retained. The appointment is not one that has any hold upon the people. In many villages I believe the land formerly granted as *ála-lambardári máfi* in Sharakpur Tahsíl is unculturable waste, and consequently, under existing orders, the ala-lambardár will be entitled to no *inâm* over and above the *ála-lambardári* cess of one per cent. Where the *máfi* land is under cultivation it now has to be resumed, and a cash *inám*, not exceeding one per cent. on a very low revenue, has to be fixed, which largely diminishes the value of the post. These cash *ináms*, varying from one to ten rupees perhaps, would, I venture to think, be infinitely better expended in the Sharakpur Tahsíl in making up *zaíl pachotrás* to a reasonable figure as I am proposing further on; and then, if there is anything over, in creating one or two inámkhors' posts in each *zail*, carrying not less than 40 or 50 rupees a year.

8. My proposals as to the disposal of the ala-lambardárs' *inám* that fall in are shown in the column of remarks of the statement accompanying this report. The object I have had in view is to strengthen the *zail* organization. I have in a separate letter forwarded this day, regarding the modification of *zails*, stated my opinion that the zaildár's pay should not be less than Rs. 180. The one per cent. deduction from the revenue hitherto sanctioned for zaildárs is not sufficient to provide this in every *zail*; but even where it is not enough I think it would be establishing a bad precedent to deduct more than the one per cent. A simple and, so far as I can see, unobjectionable solution of the difficulty is to appropriate sufficient of the lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms* together with *zamíndári ináms* that have been resumed, or will be resumed, in accordance with Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner's letter No. 2907 of 2nd May 1891, to make

up the *zail pachotra* to whatever sum is thought suitable to the special circumstances of the *zail*. Until this sum is reached the zaildár should get each *inám* that falls in. But when the zaildár's *pachotra* is complete, then it would be better, for many reasons, to wait until the lapsed *ináms* have reached a respectable sum, say not less than 40 or 50 rupees, and *then only* appoint an inámkhor to receive an *inám* of fixed amount. I take as high a sum as 40 or 50 rupees, because I believe that the smallness of the existing *ináms* is one of the chief reasons for their complete failure to bring the holders into prominence, or incite them to take an active part in Government business : on the other hand, they should not be raised too high, for fear of bringing the inámkhor too much on a level with the zaildár. I strongly advocate the amount of *inám* being fixed definitely for each *zail*, and my proposals in this respect vary from 35 to 60 rupees. I see no advantage in having more than four of these inámkhors in each *zail* ; a large number would lower the prestige of the position ; within that limit the exact number must depend on the funds available. Hitherto, in this district, the *inám* system, as tried, has not been a success. So Government should hesitate, for the present at least, before giving away more under the new system than they receive by abolishing the old. I have assumed above that *zamíndári ináms*, resumed under authority of Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner's letter No. 2907 of 2nd May 1891, are to be used in the same way as *ála-lambardáris' ináms* for creating a new system of *ináms*. If, however, that question is not finally settled, I am disposed to think that quite sufficient new *ináms* could be provided from the lapsing *ála-lambardari ináms*, alone, and that the *zamíndári inams* might well be resumed. In my proposals, however, it has been taken for granted that *zamíndári ináms* covered by letter No. 2107 will be treated alike with *ála-lambardári ináms*.

9. If the above proposals are approved, then there will be a double system of *inám* current in the district—one pertaining to the chief lamardárship in certain selected villages ; the other providing one, two, three or four minor offices of distinction in each *zail*. The financial results of my proposals are shown in the following statement :—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Inams lapsed or to lapse hereafter			Exenditure proposed.			
Name of Tahsíls.	Ala-lambardári Inám.	Zamíndári inám (*vide* Financial Commissioner's letter No. 2907 of 2nd May 1891).	Total.	Subsidies to zaildárs.	Inámkhorships.	Total.	Number of inámkhors.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Nos.
Lahore	1,865	243	2,108	218	1,380	1,598	28
Kasúr	1,816	208	2,024	118	1,857	1,975	32
Chunián	1,155	179	1,334	268	1,043	1,311	22
Sharakpur	866	431	1,297	371	860	1,231	18
Total ...	5,702	1,061	6,763	975	5,140	6,115	100

The difference between columns 4 and 6 in the Lahore Tahsíl is largely due to my having proposed no *inám* for the *zail* which includes Lahore City and Cantonments.

10. The proposals, then, made in this letter are as follows :—

1st.—Having found it impossible, owing to the conditions that exist in the district, to draw the line at villages with three lambardárs, or at those paying revenue up to a certain limit, I have only proposed the retention of the ala-lambardár's cost in those villages the circumstances of which leave room for supposing that the appointment could in any way be useful. The number of villages so selected comes to 5 per cent. of the whole. Not more than one ála-lambardár will be retained in any village.

2nd.—In three tahsíls—Lahore, Chunián and Kasúr—the ála-lambardárship should be abolished gradually by death or retirement. In *zails* where it has been decided to increase the *zail pachotra* resulting from the one per cent. *zail* allowance up to a fixed limit, as *ala-lambardári inám* or *zamíndári inám* falls in, each *inám* that lapses may go to the zaildár at once until his emoluments have reached the limit fixed ; when nothing more is to be added to the zaildár's pay, the *ináms* vacated by death or retirement should be

credited to Government, and a zaildár account kept. When enough petty *ináms* have been resumed to make one large *inám* of the amount fixed for the *zail*, an inámkhor may be appointed to receive the fixed *inám*.

3rd.—In Sharakpur, for special reasons which have been stated, I recommend the immediate abolition of the post in all but those villages in which it may be decided to retain it for good ; this will be especially beneficial in providing funds to bring up the *zail* emoluments to a proper level.

4th.—As each ála-lambardár's post is abolished, the ála-lambardár's cess will become vacant. The present orders are that it should cease to be levied. With reference to this, I venture respectfully to point out that one of the most important and carefully prepared documents of the whole settlement is the final *báchh* statement for the new assessment. This should form the basis and test of correctness of all succeeding *báchh* papers ; but if immediately after its preparation this document is to be invalidated by the exclusion from all holdings of a one per cent. cess, much of its value will be lost. It was, I imagine, on this account that the late Lieutenant-Governor directed that where an *ála-lambardári* office ceased to exist the cess should merge in the Malba Fund. In this district the *ála-lambardári* cess has been included and *báchhed* over all estates except 77 ; from the *báchh* of these it was omitted, because there was no ála-lambardár in office. My proposal is that in all cases where the *ála-lambardári* cess has been *báchhed*, and then ceases to be wanted for the ála-lambardár, the cess should merge in the Patwári Fund which, in its present conditions, is unequal to meeting the necessary expenditure on the Patwári establishment of this district. This would be a mere transfer of account, and would not be felt by the zamíndárs. Also, it would avoid the anomaly involved in making the zamíndárs of large villages, in which the office of ála-lambardár is still maintained, pay more cesses than those of other villages where that office has been dispensed with.

The 77 would escape anyhow.
W. M. Y.

5th.—The rules regarding *ináms* (Sections 172 to 174 of rules under the Land Revenue Act, Part II) may now be extended to the Lahore District.

No. 76, dated 4th May 1893.

From—G. C. WALKER, Esquire, Settlement Officer, Lahore,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge your Circular No. 38, dated 17th March, conveying orders on the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gujrát District, and to inform you that your Circular, with its enclosures, only reached my office on the morning of the 2nd May, that is, yesterday.

2. Before I was in receipt of that communication, I had framed my proposals for the partial abolition of the ála-lambardár system in this district, and when the orders reached me my report on the subject had already been faired for despatch. I am now making over charge of my duties, as Settlement Officer of the Lahore District, previous to departing on furlough, and have no time to reconsider my proposals by the light of the orders on the question in Gujrát. Thus, notwithstanding that my proposals differ considerably from the arrangements there laid down as applicable also to this district, I think it better to forward them as they are, rather than leave the question to be dealt with afresh by my successor, Munshi Arjan Dás.

3. My proposals differ from the scheme now laid down in the following respects :—

(I) In taking a higher standard of village as the test whether the ála-lambardár's post should be retained, and consequently in restricting the number of villages in which it should be retained far below the proportion sanctioned for Gujrát.

(II) In appropriating a portion of the fund arising out of the lapsing ála-lambardárs' and zamíndárs' *ináms* to raise the *pachotra* of zaildárs in *zails*, where this is below what I have assumed to be a minimum limit suitable for zaildárs' emoluments.

(III) In deferring appointment of inámkhors until enough ála-lambardárs' *ináms* have lapsed, to provide the *inám* fixed for the *zail*. If the *ináms* are credited to Government as they fall in, it will be easy to keep an account of them.

(IV) In not invariably granting *zamíndári ináms* strictly up to the full amount of the *ála-lambardári ináms* that have lapsed.

(V) In proposing that the *ála-lambardári* cess in a village, when the *ála-lambardári* has lapsed, shall not cease to be levied, but shall be incorporated with the Patwári Fund.

With reference to the orders that the *ala-lambardari* cess should cease to be levied, I venture to point out that such an alteration of the total sum *báchhed* on the estate at the new assessment on account of the revenue and cesses together, largely destroys the use of the settlement *báchh* for future reference, which is certainly a result it would be well to avoid, if possible.

Detailed Statement of the Villages in which the retention of the Ala-lambardárs has been proposed.

1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8		9		10	11
No.	Name of Zail.	Name of Village.	Tenure of Village.	Caste and number of owners.		Area in ghumáos.	Jama.	Caste and number of lambardárs.		Caste and number of Ala-lambardárs, if any.		Number of inámkhors, if any.	REMARKS.
						Lahore Tahsíl.							
							Rs.						
1	...	Ichhra ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Rájpút Aráin Khatri Others	... 45 ... 97 ... 69 ... 420	5,717	3,330	Rájpút Aráin Kamboh Khatri	2 2 2 1	Kamboh	1	...	A large village, paying a high revenue and of mixed population, so an ála-lambardár may be retained.
2	...	Amarsidhu ...	Bháiyáchára ... Pattidári ...	Ját Rájpút Others	... 95 ... 4 ... 12	2,108	850	Ját Rájpút	3 1	Ját	1	...	A comparatively small village, but there is a troop encamping-ground near it. Lambardárs are always backward in assisting here An ála-lambardár should be appointed.
3	...	Nawánkot Wár ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Aráin Ját Others	... 93 ... 7 ... 71	1,368	3,200	Aráin	3	Aráin	1	...	As No. 1.
4	...	Paki Thatti ...	Ditto ...	Aráin Ját Others	... 132 ... 61 ... 34	838	1,515	Aráin Ját	3 1	Aráin	1	...	As above.
5	...	Bábu Sábu ...	Ditto ...	Aráin Syad Others	... 158 ... 18 ... 73	2,260	626	Aráin Syad	5 1	Aráin	1	...	A large diluvial village of mixed castes. Six lambardárs. No *abádi* at present within village limits. An ála-lambardár may be required here.

6 ...	Khui Mira ...	Ditto ...	Aráin Rájpút Ját Others	107 14 5 43	670	3,148	Aráin 3 Kamboh 1	Kamboh 1	...	A large estate, paying a high revenue and near the city, populated by mixed owners. Four lambardárs. An ála-lambardár may be required.
7 ...	Kotkhoja Said ...	Ditto ...	Aráin Ját Rájpút Others	... 123 ... 20 ... 42 ... 117	1,461	1,844	Ját 1 Rájpút 2 Aráin 1	Aráin 1	...	As above.
8 ...	Rangílpur ...	Ditto ...	Aráin Rájpút Ját Others	... 88 ... 165 ... 169 ... 53	3,632	2,400	Rájpút 3 Ját 5 Aráin 1	Ját 1 Rájpút 1	...	A large estate, paying a high revenue and of mixed population, so an ála-lambardár may be retained.
9 ...	Mangah ...	Ditto ...	Ját Others	... 398 ... 150	17,187	6,214	Ját 13	Ját 2	...	A very large village, with 13 lambardárs and two ála-lambardárs. An encamping-ground for troops within its limits. One of these ála-lambardárs should be retained.
10 ...	Khudpur ...	Ditto ...	Ját Aráin Others	... 439 ... 5 ... 93	9,457	3,993	Ját 14	Ját 1	...	Fourteen lambardárs. A large village of turbulent Játs.
11 ...	Faizpur Kalán ...	Ditto ...	Aráin Khoja Others	... 379 ... 15 ... 37	2,569	2,365	Aráin 5	Aráin 1	...	A large Aráin village, into which the Khojás are getting a firm footing. An ála-lambardár may be retained.
12 ...	Chaugh Panjgaráin	Ditto ...	Rájpút Ját Aráin Others	... 119 ... 48 ... 12 ... 232	5,672	1,840	Rájpút 3 Ját 2 Dogar 1 Gujar 1	Rájpút 1 Ját 1	...	Seven lambardárs including Rájpúts and Játs and other castes. A big village, with an encamping-ground near it. A large number of fields, for which the ála-lambardár might be held responsible.
13 ...	Niazbeg ...	Ditto ...	Rájpút Others	... 149 ... 560	7,520	4,387	Rájpút 6 Dogar 1	Rájpút 2	...	Seven lambardárs. A large village, where there is an encamping-ground for troops, and a fair takes place here every year. An ála-lambardár may be retained.

Detailed Statement of the Villages in which the retention of the Ala-lambardárs has been proposed—continued.

No.	Name of Zail.	Name of Village.	Tenure of Village.	Caste and number of owners.	Area in ghumáos.	Jama.	Caste and number of lambardárs.	Caste and number of Ala-lambardárs, if any.	Number of Inámkhors, if any.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
				Lahore Tahsil—concluded.						
						Rs.				
14	...	Ghawind ..	Pattidári ...	Ját ... 298 Others ... 13	4,331	3,860	Ját 8	Ját 1	...	Eight lambardárs. A very big Ját village, paying a large revenue. Ala-lambardár may be kept.
15	...	Jahman ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 229 Others ... 43	6,419	5,000	Ját 7	Ját 1	...	Seven lambardárs. A very big Ját village paying a large revenue. Ala-lambardár may be kept.
16	...	Asal Guráke ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 53 Others ... 18	1,440	1,472	Ját 5 Khatri 1	Ját 1	...	Six lambardárs. This village is a large one and has a bad name, so the ála-lambardár may be retained.
17	...	Hudiára ...	Pattidári imperfect.	Ját ... 432 Aráin ... 50 Others ... 28	6,617	5,400	Ját 6	Ját 2	...	Six Ját lambardárs and two ala-lambardárs. Pays a revenue of Rs. 5,400. The village has a bad name for criminal offences. An ála-lambardár may be retained.
18	...	Núrpur ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját ... 80 Aráin ... 45 Others ... 56	2,019	1,720	Ját 4 Aráin 1	Ját 1	...	Five lambardárs. A large Ját community having a bad name with the Police.
19	...	Her ...	Pattidári ...	Ját ... 67 Others ... 11	3,141	2,436	Ját 4	Ját 1	...	A large village of Játs, with a canal rest-house in its limits. An ála-lambardár may be retained.

20	...	Karbath ...	Ditto ...	Ját Others	... 181 ... 19	3,744	2,400	Ját	5	Ját	1	...	Five lambardárs. A large Ját community, having a bad name with the Police.
21	...	Awán Dhaiwála ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Awán Others	... 529 ... 43	2,924	1,264	Awán	7	Awán	1	...	A large Awán village with seven lambardárs, and paying a high revenue. Ala-lambardár may be retained.
22	...	Lakho Dhar ...	Ditto ...	Ját Rájpút Awán Aráin Others	... 152 ... 63 ... 32 ... 10 ... 82	3,785	1,990	Ját Rájpút Awán	2 1 1	Ját Awan	1 1	...	A large village of mixed castes. There are now two ála-lambardárs. One may remain.
23	...	Shahdara ...	Pattidári ...	Ját Rájpút Aráin Others	... 65 ... 13 ... 72 ... 269	3,349	3,122	Ját Arora	2 1	Ját Arora	1 1	...	A large village inhabited by mixed castes. Pays a high revenue. There is a police-station and an encamping-ground. An ála-lambardár may be retained.
24	...	Kahnarao ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját Others	... 95 ... 7	3,801	1,102	Ját	3	Ját	1	...	A comparatively small village, but there is a troop encamping-ground near it. lambardárs are always backward in assisting here. An ála-lambardár should be appointed.
25	...	Padhana ...	Ditto ...	Ját Others	... 718 ... 17	5,757	5,200	Ját	14	Ját	1	...	Fourteen lambardárs. A large settlement, paying a high revenue. Ala-lambardár may be retained.
26	...	Bhasai ...	Bhaiyáchára and Pattidári.	Ját Others	... 269 ... 29	547	3,500	Ját	6	Ját	1	...	A very large village of Dhillon Játs, paying a high revenue. Ala-lambardár may be retained.
27	...	Attock Awán ...	Pattidári ...	Awán Others	... 153 ... 10	1,091	1,045	Awán Khatri	4 1	Awán	1	...	A large village of Awáns and Khatrís. Pays a large revenue. Ala-lambardár may remain.
						Kasúr Tahsíl.							
1	...	Súr Singh ...	Pattidári imperfect.	Ját Khatri	... 755 ... 25	9,862	5,600	Ját	11	Ját	1	1	A large village, paying a big revenue. Number of lambardárs unwieldy. They require a chief representative.

Detailed Statement of the Villages in which the retention of the ála-lambardárs has been proposed—continued.

1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8		9		10	11
No.	Name of Zail.	Name of Village.	Tenure of Village.	Caste and number of owners.		Area in ghumáos.	Jama.	Caste and number of lambardárs.		Caste and number of ála-lambardárs, if any.		Number of inámkhors, if any.	Remarks.
						Kasúr Tahsíl.—continued.							
							Rs.						
2	...	Narli ...	Pattidári and Bhaiyáchára.	Ját ... Bráhman ...	183 25	3,718	2,270	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	A large village, paying a big revenue. Number of lambardárs unwieldly. They require a chief representative.
3	...	Mari Megha ...	Pattidári imperfect.	Ját ... Aráin ... Sodhi ...	150 13 11	5,422	3,260	Ját	5	Ját	1	1	They are all Játs. The large number of lambardárs, however, needs a head representative.
4	...	Dal ...	Ditto ...	Ját ...	168	4,584	2,360	Ját	8	Ját	1	1	As above.
5	...	Mari Gaur Singh ...	Ditto ...	Ját ...	126	1,969	980	Ját	5	Ját	1	1	As above.
6	...	Algon ...	Ditto ...	Rájpút ...	128	7,225	4,600	Rájpút	4	Rájpút	2	2	A large and rich village. Four lambardárs. A canal rest-house is hard by the village.
7	...	Ghariála ...	Bhaiyáchára imperfect.	Ját ... Téli ...	480 10	7,070	3,310	Ját	7	Ját	1	1	As in No. 3.
8	...	Makhi Khad ...	Pattidári imperfect.	Ját ...	148	3,110	1,780	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	As above.

9	... Waltoha ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 377 Brahman ... 45	6,526	3,700	Ját	5	Ját	1	1	A big settlement with an important Ját community. Five lambardárs. A head may be desirable.
10	... Patti ...	Bhaiyáchára imperfect.	Mogal ... 227 Rájpút ... 68 Sheikh Pathán 42 Ját and others 23	6,953	4,200	Ját	4	Ját	1	1	A town of mixed castes. A chief representative is required.
11	... Subrai ...	Patti imperfect	Ját ... 565 Brahman ... 12 Others ... 17	14,637	4,795	Ját	12	Ját	2	2	Mixed castes and a large number of lambardárs. Formerly there were two ála-lambardárs. Now one may be kept.
12	... Kot Budha ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 43	2,101	1,159	Ját	5	Ját	1	1	A dialluvial village where much river work arises each year. Number of lambardárs large.
13	... Talwandi Sobha ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 83	3,166	1,360	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	Six lambardárs, so an ála-lambardár may be advisable.
14	... Rájajang ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját ... 339 Brahman ... 26 Others ... 10	13,222	5,600	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	A very large settlement, paying a heavy revenue. Six lambardárs. A headman may be useful.
15	... Kotli Rai Bobakar...	Pattidári ...	Ját ... 45 Khatri ... 33	6,887	1,344	Rájpút Khatri	3 1	Rájpút	1	1	A large village, Rájpúts and Khatrís mixed. Four lambardárs. Ala-lambardár may be retained.
16	... Rajoke	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját ... 236 Others ... 20	6,232	4,000	Ját	4	Ját	1	1	A big Ját village paying a heavy revenue. Four lambardárs. A head lambardár may be retained.
17	... Wán	Ditto ...	Ját ... 259	512	2,100	Ját	7	Ját	1	1	Seven lambardárs, a number for which a chief representative is required.
18	... Luliani	Pattidári ...	Ját ... 256 Khatri ... 12 Others ... 1	1,192	4,750	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	Lambardárs will be increased now probably to ten. It is a very big settlement on the high road to Kasúr. An encamping-ground with a thána are within its limits.

Detailed Statement of the Villages in which the retention of the ála-lambardárs has been proposed—continued.

1 No.	2 Name of Zail.	3 Name of Village.	4 Tenure of Village.	5 Caste and number of owners.	6 Area in ghumáos.	7 Jama.	8 Caste and number of lambardárs.	9 Caste and number of ála-lambardárs, if any.	10 Number of inámkhors, if any.	11 Remarks.
				Kasúr Tahsíl—concluded.						
						Rs.				
19	...	Khem Karan ...	Pattidári ... Bhaiyáchara.	Ját ... 5 Kamboh ... 49 Khatri ... 10 Bráhman ... 13	761	2,750	Kamboh 4	Kamboh 1	1	A Municipality. Land owners of mixed tribes. A very difficult village to get work out of. An ála-lambardár is required here.
20	...	Kot Morád Khan ...	Ditto ...	Aráin ... 120 Kamboh ... 70	2,014	1,150	Aráin 4 Kamboh 1	Aráin 1 Kamboh 1	1	A large village near the town of Kasúr. Lambardárs are difficult to work. An ála-lambardár may be useful.
21	...	Jaura ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 104 Kamboh ... 103 Others ... 10	3,048	2,050	Ját 4 Kamboh 2	Ját 1	1	Six lambardárs of two tribes mixed. A large and important village. Ala-lambardár may be retained.
22	...	Bhila	Pattidári ...	Ját ... 62 Aráin ... 44 Rájpút ... 27 Khatri ... 1	3,146	2,200	Ját 2 Rájpút 2 Aráin 1	Ját 1 Rájpút 1	2	A village of mixed castes. Five lambardárs. Formerly two ála-lambardárs. One now may be retained.
23	...	Hussáin Kháuwala	Bhaiyáchara ...	Aráin ... 107 Rájpút ... 8	1,331	950	Aráin 4	Aráin 1	1	Near a canal rest-house. Probably they have got used to leaving the work to the ála-lambardár.
24	...	Chanda Singhwála	Pattidári ... Bhaiyáchara imperfect.	Ját ... 119 Aráin ... 9	2,385	1,103	Ját 5	Ját 1	1	A village of mixed tribes. Five lambardárs. A river village and much riverain work. An ála-lambardár would be useful.

25	...	Rattoke ...	Bhaiyáchára perfect.	Ját ..	188	5,380	2,341	Ját	9	Ját	1	1	A village of Jats. Nine lambardárs. A head lambardár should be kept.
26	...	Naggar Amianpur...	Pattidári ... Bhaiyáchára imperfect.	Jat ... Dogar ... Kamboh ...	5 22 35	2,382	1,269	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	Six lambardárs. A heavy river village. An ála-lambardár may be retained.
					Chúnián Tahsíl.								
1	...	Bhuchoke Par ...	Pattidári Bhaiyáchára.	Ját ... Bráhman ... Khatri ... Others ...	91 28 10 8	2,815	258	Ját	5	Ját	1	...	The village is a large one though of late greatly reduced by river action. There are five lambardárs, a quite unworkable number, and it is well they should have a head representative. The present man has been useful during settlement.
2	...	Jajja	Pattidári ...	Ját ... Others ...	25 10	406	90	Ját	1	Ját	1	...	There are two or three separate homesteads in this village, The Gills are not on good terms with the Sandhu Sardárs. On this ground a head representative may be useful.
3	...	Gagga Sarai ...	Pattidári imperfect.	Ját ... Others ...	267 25	6,130	1,900	Ját	7	Ját	1	1	Seven lambardárs ; an unwieldy number. Three distinct homesteads. An ála-lambardár should be useful.
4	...	Natheh Jágír ...	Pattidári ...	Ját ... Others ...	225 33	3,078	850	Ját	6	Ját	1	1	A village of Jats, many of whom are bad characters, chiefly among them some of the lambardárs. For Police purposes a chief representative should be useful.
5	...	Bhamba	Pattidári imperfect.	Ját ... Others ...	204 19	8,762	3,800	Ját	8	Ját	1	1	Eight lambardárs ; an unwieldy number. Two separate homesteads. A large revenue.

Detailed Statement of the Villages in which the retention of the ala-lambardárs has been proposed—continued.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
No.	Name of Zail.	Name of Village.	Tenure of Village.	Caste and number of owners.	Area in ghumáos.	Jama.	Caste and number of lambardárs.	Caste and number of ala-lambardárs, if any.	Number of inámkhors, if any.	Remarks.
				Chúnián Tahsíl—concluded.						
						Rs.				
6	...	Baghiána Kalán ...	Pattidári imperfect.	Jat ... 183 Others ... 59	6,795	2,460	Ját 4	Ját 1	1	A large village, with a number of well-to-do Khatrís. The Játs are very well-to-do. Present ála-lambardár drinks, but the next man may be an improvement.
7	...	Jambhar Khurd ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját ... 186 Others ... 39	3,114	1,000	Ját 5	Ját 1	1	These two villages adjoin one another and have rivalries. An ála-lambardár to each may serve to keep the peace.
8	...	Jambhar Kalán	Ditto ...	Ját ... 86 Others ... 54	4,460	1,200	Ját 4	Ját 1	1	
9	...	Chúnián Khas ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 105 Aráin ... 75 Kamboh ... 85 Others ... 54	18,843	7,200	Ját 7	Ját 4	...	Tahsíl Head-quarters. People of mixed castes. An ála-lambardár should be of use.
10	...	Chorkot ...	Ditto ...	Dogar ... 26 Others ... 99	5,697	1,400	Dogar 3	Dogar 1	1	Dogars are the principal owners, but there is a large number of mixed castes, to represent whom ála-lambardár is probably required.
11	...	Khuddián ...	Ditto ...	Kamboh ... 154 Khatri ... 265 Aráin ... 129 Ját ... 14 Others ... 80	8,649	3,000	Kamboh 1 Khatri 1 Aráin 1 Ját 1	Kamboh 1 Khatri 1	1	A Municipality of mixed castes. Lambardárs in such a state want work. Ala-lambardár may be retained.

12 ...	Dholan	Ditto ...	Aráin Hindu ... 247	3,438	2,000	Aráin 2 Kamboh 1	Aráin 1	1	A big village. People are very quiet and inoffensive and of an excellent cultivating class. A good many traders. Ala-lambardár may come useful.
13 ...	Kanganpur... ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 49 Rájpút ... 47 Others ... 24	3,529	1,500	Ját 6	Ját 1	1	A small town of mixed castes in which Khatrís are getting the upper hand. The other tribes require a strong representative.
14 ...	Mokal	Pattidári ...	Ját ... 26 Khatri ... 13 Others ... 3	8,671	5,000	Ját 4	Ját 1	...	A large village, with a number of powerful Khatrís. Most of the owners and also the lambardárs are very slack in doing any Government business. Present ála-lambardár is the worst of the lot. However, his successor when he comes in may be an improvement.
15 ...	Doburji	Bhaiyáchára ...	Dogar ... 47 Rora ... 4	2,925	1,460	Dogar 5	Dogar 1	...	A village of Dogras, who have a bad name for criminal offences. Ala-lambardár should be useful to the Police.

Sharakpur Tahsíl.

1 ...	Tapiola	Bhaiyáchára imperfect.	Kamboh ... 139 Khatri ... 9 Others ... 10	4,673	2,200	Kamboh 3 Rájpút 1 Labána 1	Kamboh 1	...	Extra Tahsíldár says there ought to be an ala-lambardár here. There are five lambardárs and a revenue of Rs. 2,200. A lot of sáhúkárs.
2 ...	Labanwála	Ditto ...	Labána ... 143 Rájpút ... 30 Khatri ... 26 Others ... 32	2,116	2,050	Labána 4 Rájpút 1 Sheikh 1	Labána 1	...	A big village with six lambardárs where Khatrís are numerous. Extra Tahsíldár thinks there should be an ála-lambardár here.
3 ...	Ghazi Koka ...	Ditto ...	Ját ... 119 Bráhman ... 30 Others ... 26	1,798	2,200	Ját 6	Jat 1	1	A big village, paying a big revenue, should have one.
4 ...	Kot Pindi Dás ...	Ditto ...	Labána ... 274 Others ... 42	8,486	3,600	Labána 11	Labána 2	...	Extra Tahsíldár says there ought to be an ála-lambardár here because there are eleven lambardárs and revenue is Rs. 3,600, and a lot of sáhúkárs.

Detailed Statement of the Villages in which the retention of the ala-lambardárs has been proposed—concluded.

1 No.	2 Name of Zail.	3 Name of Village.	4 Tenure of Village.	5 Caste and number of owners.	6 Area in ghumáos.	7 Jama.	8 Caste and number of lambardárs.	9 Caste and number of ala-lambardárs, if any.	10 Number of inámkhors, if any.	11 Remarks.
				Sharakpur Tahsíl—conclnded.						
						Rs.				
5	...	Khanpur	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját ... 43 Dogar ... 10 Others ... 11	2,797	1,500	Ját 4 Dogar 1	Dogar 1	...	Five lambardárs. Extra Tahsíldár says Khatrís very strong here. An ála-lambardár should be here to stand up against them.
6	...	Killa Pucca ...	Pattidári ...	Ját 58 Khatri 14 Kamboh 2 Others 2	1,537	820	Ját 5 Kamboh 1	Ját 1	...	None of the lambardárs lives in the village.
7	...	Mangu Tarn ...	Bhaiyáchára ...	Ját 48 Bráhman 12 Others 11	1,179	970	Ját 3	Ját 1	...	Mixed tribes. A *qusba*. An ála-lambardár should be here.
8	...	Sharakpur ...	Bhaiyáchára imperfect.	Aráin 569 Rájpút 34 Others 82	3,612	3,000	Aráin 5	Aráin 2	...	Five Aráin lambardárs. Two ála-lambardárs, Sadr Makán. One ála-lambardár should remain.
9	...	Gházipur ...	Bhaiyáchára perfect.	Ját 192 Aráin 12 Others 24	1,862	1,600	Ját 4	Ját 1	1	Perhaps one ála-lambardár should be here.
10	...	Bhaini ...	Ditto ditto...	Aráin 166 Dogar 62 Ját 40 Others 98	1,209	1,250	Ját 1 Dogar 1 Aráin 1	Aráin 1	1	There are a lot of Khatrís here, and one ála-lambardár should be appointed.

No. 497, dated Lahore, 9th August 1893.

From—M. W. Fenton, Esquire, Senior Secretary to the Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

Hon'ble W. M. Young, C.S.I. Commissioner, Lahore's No. 595, dated 19th June 1893, with enclosures.

I am directed to submit, for the orders of Government, the correspondence noted in the margin, containing the proposals of the local officers regarding the *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the district of Lahore, and to convey the following remarks of the Financial Commissioner.

2. Under the authority conveyed in paragraph 7 of Mr. Thomson's letter No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893, it would have been competent for the Financial Commissioner to sanction for Lahore the arrangements approved by Government in that correspondence for Gujrát. Mr. Walker's proposals, however, differ in several respects from those sanctioned for the Gujrát District. The points of difference and resemblance will be seen at a glance from the following analysis:—

No.	Gujrát proposals.	Lahore proposals.
1	Ala-lambardárs to be abolished in all villages containing less than three lambardárs.	Ala-lambardárs to be abolished in all but 78 villages in the district, these villages being selected by the Settlement Officer, not as containing three or more lambardárs but as being suited in Settlement Officer's opinion for the *ála-lambardári* system.
2	Not more than one ála-lambardár to be retained in any village.	Same as Gujrát.
3	Abolition to take effect from the death of existing incumbents.	Same as in Gujrát, *except* in Tahsíl Sharakpur, where abolition is proposed to take effect immediately.
4	As each ála-lambardárship is thus abolished the *ála-lambardári* cess will concurrently cease to be levied in that village.	As each ála-lambardárship is abolished the *ála-lambardári* cess will concurrently be credited to the Patwári Fund.
5	The *ála-lambardári ináms* which have been substituted for *ála-lambardári mafís* to be enjoyed by all ála-lambardárs for the time being.	Same as Gujrát.
6	Upon the abolition of an ála-lambardárship the *inám* attached thereto will be converted into a *zamíndári inám*.	Same as in Gujrát, except that a portion of the resumed *ála-lambardári ináms* will be reserved for the purpose of increasing zaildárs' emoluments where such emoluments are too low.
7	*Ala-lambardári ináms* to be converted into *zamíndári ináms* AT ONCE without waiting until the amount resumed makes up a *zamíndári inám* of full value.	Resumed *ála-lambardári ináms* to be credited to Government until they amount to Rs. 35 to Rs. 60 sufficient to make up a *zamíndári inám* of respectable amount.
8	Deputy Commissioner may sanction *ináms* up to a limit of Rs. 40 and Commissioner up to a limit of Rs. 80.	*Ináms* to vary from Rs. 35 to Rs. 60.

The points of difference in regard to which the orders of Government are required are noted under Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 in the above statement. In the Financial Commissioner's opinion Mr. Walker gives good reason for not adopting any hard-and-fast rule as to the villages in which ála-lambardárs should be retained and also for the immediate abolition of the system in the Sharakpur Tahsíl except in the few villages where it will be permanently retained.

3 The Financial Commissioner is, however, unable to recommend proposal No. 4, and in his recent reference to Government regarding the future Patwári arrangements of the Lahore District has recommended that no contribution should be made to the Patwár Fund from the *ála-lambardári* cess. But he appreciates Mr. Walker's desire to preserve his carefully-made *báchh* from disturbance, and, if Government has no objection, he would allow the lapsed *ála-lambardári* cess in villages where the ála-lambardárs are abolished to be credited to *malba*, the *malba* collections being *pro tanto* diminished. It will be remembered that Government originally ruled that the *ála-lambardári* cess should be so credited, where it ceased to be required, and the only reason for ruling otherwise was that there was no need for continuing to levy it at all. Here the Settlement Officer has given a reason, one of expediency, not of principle; but so far as it goes it is worthy of consideration, and the course proposed will not make any real difference to the people.

4. With reference to paragraph 10 (5) of the Settlement Officer's letter No. 72, dated 4th May, the Financial Commissioner recommends that the rules regarding *ináms* (Sections 172 to 174 of Rules under Land Revenue Act) may now be extended to the Lahore District.

5. With reference to the question of existing *zamíndáriináms* referred to in paragraph 8 of the Settlement Officer's letter and paragraph 5 of the Commissioner's letter, I am to say that the Settlement Officer has misinterpreted the Financial Commissioner's orders on the subject which were that such personal *zamíndári ináms* should be resumed on the death of each present incumbent, in accordance with the terms of grant, the heirs in each case taking their chance of obtaining a converted *ála-lambardári inám* under the present arrangements. The usual practice is to allow *zamindári ináms*, in addition to the one per cent. deduction from the land revenue given to zaildárs, to the aggregate amount of about one-quarter per cent. on the land revenue, and it will be seen from the table given in paragraph 9 of the Settlement Officer's letter that the amount which will become available for the creation of new *ináms* from converted *ála-lambardári ináms* (column 2) will be considerably in excess of one-quarter per cent. on the new land revenue demand, even in Sharakpur, and after deduction of the proposed subsidies to zaildárs column 5. The existing *zamíndári* life *ináms* (column 3) should, therefore, as above noticed, be resumed, the Financial Commissioner thinks, on the death of the present holders.

6. As regards proposal No. 6, the general rule is that zaildárs should receive *ináms* in addition to the ordinary *zaildári* allowance. But Mr. Walker has submitted proposals which are being separately considered for revising the *zaildári* arrangements of the Lahore District, whereby the prescribed allowance of one per cent. deduction from the land revenue will form an inadequate remuneration (less than Rs. 150 per annum) for the zaildár in some circles. The Financial Commissioner therefore recommends that the *zaildári* allowance may be supplemented by an *inám* in such cases, as proposed by the Settlement Officer. As noticed in the preceding paragraph, there will still be provision eventually, even in Sharakpur, for *zamíndári ináms* exceeding in the aggregate the usual one-quarter per cent. on the land revenue.

7. Proposal No. 7 differs, it will be seen, from what has been done in Gujrát, but there seems no objection to dealing with the matter in Lahore as Mr. Walker recommends.

No. 302, dated Lahore, 13th December 1893.

From—J. M. Douie, Esquire, Offg. Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I am directed to reply as follows to your letter No. 497, dated 9th August 1893 (Sub-head 61, File No. 70), regarding *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the Lahore District.

2. The Lieutenant-Governor accepts Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7 and 8 of the proposals shown in the analysis in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply. As regards the remaining proposals, I am to say with reference to No. 3 that His Honor considers that existing interests, whether great or small, should be respected; and he is therefore unable to sanction the immediate abolition of *ála-lambardári* in the Sharakpur Tahsíl. As regards the 4th proposal, the Lieutenánt-Governor thinks it will be best to follow the course adopted in Gujrát and other districts. Adverting to the 6th proposal, I am to point out that a similar arrangement was recommended in Karnál by your letter No. 251, dated 7th April 1890, and was negatived in this office letter No. 192, dated 17th June 1890. The question can, however, be finally determined when the revision of *zaildári* arrangements in Lahore has been completed and should the Financial Commissioner still consider the course suggested advisable.

No. 483, dated 16th January 1894.

Endorsement by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

Copy of Punjab Government letter No. 302, dated 13th December 1893, and of Financial Commissioner's No. 497, dated 9th August 1893, forwarded to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division, in reply to his No. 595, dated 19th June 1893, for information and guidance, with the remark that the question of supplementing the zaildárs ordinary allowance in certain cases by the grant of a *zamíndári inám* has been again referred to Government in sending on Mr. Walker's proposals for revising the *zaildári* arrangements of the district.

Extract para. 4 from a letter—No. 4, dated 3rd January 1894, from the Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, to the Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab

As regards the question of supplementing the zaildár's ordinary remuneration in some cases by the grant of a *zamíndári inám*, which has been reserved for further consideration by the orders contained in your letter No. 302, dated 13th ultimo, Mr. Rivaz is still of opinion that this should be allowed as a special case in the present instance, though he thinks that the minimum remuneration of a zaildár in the Lahore District might be fixed at Rs. 150 per annum instead of Rs. 180 as proposed by the Settlement Officer. He recommends, therefore, that where the ordinary allowance falls short of Rs. 150, the zaildár be given a *zamíndári inám* to make up the difference from the fund which will be created by the resumption of *ála-lambardári ináms* where the *ála-lambardári* system is being abolished. It is obviously desirable that every zaildár should receive a fairly adequate remuneration, and the grant of *zamíndári ináms* where necessary, as above proposed, is, in the Financial Commissioner's opinion, a preferable measure to either enhancing the usual deduction of 1 per cent. on the revenue of the circle in the cases in question, or funding the 1 per cent. deductions for the whole district, as suggested by the Commissioner. This latter measure would be opposed to one of the main principles of the zaildár system, and an infringement of Rule 171 (I) under the Land Revenue Act.

Extract para. 2 from a letter—No. 174, dated Lahore, 9th March 1894.

From—J. M. Douie, Esquire, Offg. Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab,

To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick accepts in substance the views expressed by the Financial Commissioner. But he does not quite understand the question of form raised in the latter part of the 4th paragraph of your letter under reply. It seems to the Lieutenant-Governor that it is entirely within our discretion to allow a zaildár any portion of the collections in his *zail* which we please. He does not see that it makes much difference in what shape we allow it, but in this particular case he is content to leave the matter in the Financial Commissioner's hands.

No. 241, dated Lahore, 27th March 1894.

From—M. W. Fenton, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Offg. Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

With reference to the remarks made in paragraph 2 of your letter No. 174, dated 9th March 1894, relating to the revision of the *zaildári* arrangements of the Lahore District, I am directed to say that the meaning of the last sentence in paragraph 4 of this office letter No. 4, dated 3rd January 1894, was that under Rule 171 (1) of the Land Revenue Act some percentage of the land revenue of a *zail* has to be prescribed for the remuneration of the zaildár. Government can of course prescribe whatever percentage it pleases, but it was obviously not meant that the percentage should vary in incovenient fractions from *zail* to *zail*, as would be the probable result of the Commissioner's proposal to fund at the rate of 1 per cent. for the whole district, and to pay each zaildár a suitable sum from such fund. In short, this would practically amount to converting the *zaildári* system in the Lahore District into an *inámdári* system under Rules 173 and 174 of the Land Revenue Act.

C. M. Rivaz, Esquire, c.s.

No. 2161, dated 27th March 1894.

Endorsement by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

Copy of Punjab Government No. 174, dated 9th March 1894, with copy of letter replied to, forwarded to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Lahore Division, in continuation of this office endorsement No. 483, dated 16th January 1894, with the remark that the arrangements proposed in this office letter No 4, dated 3rd January 1894, to the address of the Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab, may be acted upon.

The original enclosures of his letter No. 1077, dated 1st December 1893, are herewith returned.

Extract from the Final Settlement Report, Lahore.

127. Chief headmen were appointed in all villages at the revised settlement of 1868, and an additional cess of one per cent. on the land revenue was levied for their benefit over and above the five per cent. *pachotra* cess levied for the remuneration of all the headmen of the village. Also a piece of the village common waste, of varying area, was set apart for the use of the chief headman for the time being; to this alienation the consent of the share-holders was recorded in a vernacular proceeding, though it is doubtful how far they really agreed to part with any land. Sometimes there was no common waste, in which case generally the Settlement Officer on his own authority assigned to the office the revenue on a few acres of cultivated land. This administrative measure was carried to the absurdity of appointing a chief lambardár even when there was only one in the village, and of making two chief lambardárs in some villages. In 1888 the question of retaining this appointment was raised. The great majority of Revenue Officers consulted were in favour of abolishing it. Eventually it was ordered that the office should be retained for the present, but that any Settlement Officer might submit proposals asking for modification of that decision as his settlement came to a close. Meanwhile any land assignments made in favour of the office at the previous settlement should be resumed and cash *ináms* granted in their place as each tahsíl came under assessment. This was done, and in all four tahsils the cash *ináms* fixed for the chief headmen at assessment amounted to Rs. 7,251. Subsequently, in May 1893, proposals were submitted for the abolition of the office in all but 78 villages. This has been sanctioned by Government in their letter No. 302, dated 13th December 1893. The abolition is to come into effect as the present incumbent of the office dies or is otherwise removed; on such abolition the one per cent. cess hitherto levied for the chief headman, is to cease, and his cash *ináms* will lapse to Government. When sufficient of these *ináms* have lapsed in each *zail*, larger *zamíndári ináms* may be created from their proceeds; not more than two or three to each *zail*, and varying in amount between Rs. 40 and Rs. 60.

Ala-lambardárs or chief headmen.

The following statement shows the number of chief headmen to be retained in each tahsíl, the value of the *ináms* to be retained in each tahsíl and of those to be resumed. Each village in which retention has been sanctioned is named in the list, which forms part of the printed correspondence on the proposals :—

1	2	3	4	5
Tahsíl.	Number of villages in which chief headmen's office is to be retained.	Value of cash inams of ala-lambardar.		
		To be retained.	To be resumed gradually.	Already resumed.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Lahore	27	558	1,691	174
Kasur	26	581	1,583	233
Chúnián	15	252	1,094	61
Sharakpur	10	156	771	95
Total District	78	1,547	5,139	563

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE GUJRAT DISTRICT.

No. 3175, dated 16th November 1892.

From—D. C. J. IBBETSON, Esquire, Offg. Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division,
To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I HAVE the honor to forward, for orders of the Financial Commissioner, copy of a letter No. 136, dated 10th October 1892, from Settlement Collector, Gujrát, on the subject of *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the Gujrát Tahsíl. The report is submitted at the present stage in accordance with instructions received with your letter No. 4260 of 5th July 1892, paragraph 4.

2. The orders of Government which regulate the treatment of this question are contained in Junior Secretary to Government's letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890, to your address, but were modified in one respect by paragraph 2 (5) of Revenue Secretary's letter No. 115, dated 27th June 1892, conveying orders on the *ála-lambardári* system of the Gurdáspur District. They may be summarised as follows:—

(*a*) Ala-lambardárs may be abolished in all villages having only one or two lambardárs, and in any others where the peculiarity of tenure makes the system inapplicable.

(*b*) In villages in which the office is to be abolished the *ála-lambardári* cess will continue to be realized in favour of the present incumbent of the office. Upon his vacating the office the cess will be discontinued.

(*c*) The *ála-lambardári máfis* will be assessed and cash *ináms* granted in their stead to the value of the revenue imposed or imposable upon those *mafis* under the new assessment subject to a *maximum* in each case of 1 per cent. on the revenue of the village.

(*d*) In the villages referred to in (*b*) above these *ináms* will be continued only for the life of each present holder of the office. Upon his vacating the office the *inám* will lapse; and as lapses occur in the villages of each *zail*, equivalent sums may be granted as *zamíndári ináms* to selected headmen in the *zail* in accordance with a scheme to be now laid down.

3. As regards (*a*), the Settlement Collector proposes to continue the office in all villages in which there are three or more headmen. In villages where more than one chief headman exists, he proposes to continue one only of the offices. All appointments not continued under the above proposals will lapse at once, if vacant, or from the occurrence of the next vacancy. When full effect has been given to these proposals the result for the whole tahsíl will be as follow:—

	Existing.	Final proposals.
Number of villages assessed	No. 543	No. 543
Number of villages in which chief headmen exist	" 530	" 93
Number of chief headmen	" 543	" 93
Total revenue (new assessment)	Rs. 3,60,340	Rs. 3,60,340
Revenue of villages in which chief headmen exist	" 3,60,096	" 1,41,194

These proposals are in accordance with the orders of Government, and I recommend them for sanction.

4. As regards (*b*), the Settlement Collector proposes that the discontinuance of the cess shall have effect from the kharíf next following the occurrence of the vacancy. I think it will be well to lay this down. In the meanwhile the cess might go to the successor to the vacant lambardárship.

5. The orders summarized at (*c*) have been carried out with the result that cash *ináms* to the value of Rs. 3,380 have been granted to the existing chief headmen. The

details are shown in enclosed Statement No. I. The *ináms* are for the most part exceedingly small, and in 74 out of the 530 villages in which chief headmen exist are of less value than 1 per cent. on the revenue, the defect being in most cases nominal. In three villages they exceed this amount by Rs. 2, Re. 1 and Re. 1, respectively.

6. The only point that presents any difficulty is the disposal of *ináms* which will lapse on the death of the present holder under the orders summarized at (*d*) above. The nature of the difficulty anticipated by Captain Davies is set forth in paragraph 8 of his letter. I notice that in his pargraph 7 he seems to have somewhat misunderstood the orders of Government. The *ináms* will lapse on the occurrence of a vacancy only in those villages in which that vacancy is not filled up. Where the office of ála-lambardár is to be continued the *inám* will be enjoyed by the holder of the day till the expiry of the present settlement. The *ináms* in villages of the latter class amount to Rs. 1,315, leaving Rs. 2,065 only, which will eventually be available for *zamíndári ináms*.

7. Captain Davies proposes that the income available from lapsed *ináms* shall be eventually expended on 162 *zamíndári ináms* of the value of Rs. 20 each, to be distributed as shown in the statement appended to his letter. The fixed rate of Rs. 20 necessarily makes the ultimate value of the new *ináms* differ from the value of the lapsed *ináms* in each *zail*. The differences are small ; but I think the orders of Government should be carried out and the income available in each *zail* disposed of within that *zail*. The people will then more easily follow the money and see how it is being expended, and that no portion of it is being resumed.

8. Captain Davies further proposes to grant *ináms* at once, without waiting for any lapses, to the value of half the amount which will ultimately be available. He leaves it an open question whether the extra expenditure thus incurred shall eventually be balanced by refraining from allotting further *ináms* after lapses have accumulated to the amount now to be granted. For reasons to be given presently, I think that to so refrain would be very objectionable. On the other hand, to grant half the *ináms* at once would not relieve us of the difficulties described by Captain Davies in connection with the remaining half ; and I see no sufficient ground for incurring the additional expenditure which such a course would involve.

9. I understand that the object which Sir James Lyall had in view in issuing the orders under which proposals are now being made was as follows: *Ináms*, however irregular, or unusual, or unnecessary, had been enjoyed by one or more headmen in each village for a long time past. The assessment was being largely enhanced. Accordingly, while it was necessary to modify the system under which these *ináms* were enjoyed, His Honor wished, first, to introduce the change only on the occurrence of vacancies, and secondly, to continue for the term of the present settlement to distribute in the form of *ináms* within each *zail* the whole of the *inám* income that had previously been enjoyed by that *zail* and *to let the people see that this was being done*. This last point seems to me of the essence of the orders (*see* paragraph 5 of Junior Secretary's letter No. 31 of 1st February 1890, to your address) ; and to ensure it I would propose that every *inám* should be re-allotted from the date of lapse. I admit that this was apparently not contemplated by Sir James Lyall—*see* the last sentence of paragraph 4 of the letter just quoted. But I think it is in accordance with the whole spirit of his orders, and I agree with Captain Davies that the keeping of separate accounts of lapses and grants for each *zail* would be a great burden, and probably would not be performed properly. The objection to my proposal is that we should have inámdárs holding *ináms* of only one or two rupees. In any case, they would be in no worse state than the old holders of the same *inám*. And the selected inámdár would know that his *inám* would increase as further lapses occurred.

10. The selection of the inámdárs and the allotment of lapsed *ináms* would be made by the Deputy Commissioner subject to standing rules, and the only restriction that I would impose would be that the final *inám* held by any one inámdár should not exceed Rs. 20 or fall short of Rs. 10 without the sanction of the Commissioner. Thus, if the first *inám* that lapsed in a *zail* was one of Re. 1, the Deputy Commissioner would select the most worthy man in the *zail*, not being a zaildár, and not being already in receipt of an *ála-lambárdári inám* of more than Rs. 19, and allot it to him. All subsequent lapses would then go to him of necessity until a *minimum* of Rs. 10 had been reached. After that the Deputy Commissioner might either continue to allot to him up to Rs. 20 or select another inámdár who would be treated in a similar manner. Eventually, on a lapse occurring, it would be for the Deputy Commissioner to decide to which of the existing inámdárs of the *zail* it should go (if not to a new one) subject to the above limits of value. This plan would, I think, obviate all the difficulties anticipated by Captain Davies.

11. With regard to the condition of tenure to be recorded for the *ináms* as they now stand (*see* the latter portion of paragraph 7 of Captain Davies' letter) it should be—

(*a*) In villages in which the office of ála-lambardár is to be continued, that the grant is made for the term of settlement to the ála-lambardár for the time being.

(b) In villages in which the office is to be eventually abolished, that the grant is made to the existing ála-lambardár for so long as he continues to hold that office; and on his ceasing to do so will be allotted by the Deputy Commissioner to an inámdár to be selected by him from within the *zail*.

12. The rules for inámdárs (Nos. 172 to 174 under the Land Revenue Act) should be extended by notification to the Gujrát District, as has been done in the similar case of Gurdáspur.

No. 136, dated 10th October 1892.

From—The Settlement Collector, Gujrát,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

I HAVE the honor to address you on the subject of the reduction of sarpanches, or ála-lambardárs, of Tahsíl Gujrát, and in the disposal of the *ináms* which they now hold in addition to their remuneration of 1 per cent.

2. The present orders on this subject are contained in Junior Secretary, Punjab's letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890, which was subsequently modified by Secretary to Financial Commissioner's letter to Commissioner, Ráwalpindi, No. 5315, dated 26th August 1892.

3. The effect of these orders is that Settlement Officers have power to recommend the abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system in villages which contain less than three lambardárs. The abolition of the post of ála-lambardár cannot take effect in any village until such post becomes vacant in the natural course of things; and on the abolition of the post in any village the *ála-lambardári* cess will cease to be collected from ensuing kharíf.

4. In Gujrát Tahsíl a cess of 1 per cent. on the revenue of the village has been levied for the remuneration of ála-lambardárs, but in addition, at the settlement of 1867 either plots of unassessed waste land at half-rates were set apart for these village officers. In accordance with the orders quoted above, at the time of announcing the new assessments, these grants, commonly known as *sarpanchi ináms*, were assessed; the land was resumed and a cash *inám*, equal to the revenue now assessed on the land, was entered in the name of the existing ála-lambardár. If, however, the new assessment on these plots exceeded 1 per cent. on the assessment of the village, the *inám* was fixed at 1 per cent. on the assessment.

5. There are, therefore, two questions to be considered,—(1) the villages in which the post of ála-lambardár should be reduced; (2) the disposal of the *ináms* at present held by ála-lambardárs. With reference to the first question, I submit two statements showing (1) the names of villages of the tahsíl by *zails*, the new assessment, number of lambardárs, number of sarpanches and the cash *ináms* now held; and (2) the villages in which it is proposed to retain ála-lambardárs and the number which are to be retained.

6. I propose that in all villages in which there are less than three lambardárs no new appointment to the post of ála-lumbardár shall be made, and that in these villages the appoinment shall cease to exist from the date of the occurrence of a vacancy. In villages which now contain more than one ála-lambardár, I propose that as vacancies in the post occur they shall be absorbed until they leave such villages with one ála-lambardár. I have no reason to make an exception with regard to any particular village.

7. The question of the disposal of the unauthorized *ála-lambardári ináms* is more difficult. These *ináms* amount to Rs. 3,380 and are distributed in very small sums among 543 persons. I propose that on the death or dismissal of any ála-lambardár the cash *inám* which he now holds in virtue of his office shall lapse. The resumption of these grants will necessarily extend over a number of years. It seems necessary that a condition should be attached to these grants that they are to be held by the present incumbents during the period that they hold the office of ála-lambardár, but in no case is such period to exceed the term of settlement. Thus on the expiration of the present settlement they will all disappear.

Note by Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioners.—It has not yet been decided to abolish ála-lambardárs entirely at next settlement.

8. The orders laid down that "an account would have to be kept of the lapses of the *ála-lambardári ináms* in each *zail*, and against the amount of these the Deputy Commissioner would have from time to time to propose *zamíndári ináms* for the sanction of the Commissioner." I am unable to propose any suitable plan by which this object may be obtained. The majority of the *ináms* are so small that it would be almost useless to propose them as *zamíndári ináms* as they fell in; and if it were necessary to wait while esveral *ináms* lapsed in one *zail* before proposing a *zamíndári inám* for that *zail*, a great complication in accounts would take place, either on account of lapsed *ináms* having been kept in deposit for a number of years, or if they had been resumed the labour entailed in verifying the dates on which they were resumed.

9. My proposal is that in place of the *ála-lambardári ináms* amounting to Rs. 3,380 per annum, 162 *zamíndári ináms* of Rs. 20 each be given. The expenditure on these *inám*

will be Rs. 3,240 or rather less than the present *ináms*. But as the *ála-lambardári ináms* will only lapse by degrees, it seems impossible to give the whole of these *ináms* at once. I, therefore, suggest that authority be granted to give immediately half this number of *zamíndári ináms*, or 81, amounting to Rs. 1,620, or a little under ½ per cent. on the *jama*, to selected headmen who have done good work and helped in the settlement. These *ináms* would be given in cash out of the *jama* of the village in which the recipient lives. On his death it would be transferred to some other suitable person in the *zail*. If such person belonged to a different village the cash *ináms* would be resumed in the old village and be given out of the revenue of the village to which the new grantee belonged. These *zamíndári ináms* would be held for life or good conduct, and should be considered as being bestowed for good and loyal service. Lapse of time will show whether it will be necessary to give the remaining *ináms* as they fall due. The present expenditure will be rather more than it was previously, but the immediate increase is less than ½ per cent. on the revenue, and will constantly grow less as vacancies in the post of ála-lambardar occur.

10. To sum up, my proposals are as follows :—

(1). To appoint no new ála-lambardár in villages having less than three lambardárs.

(2). To retain the post of ála-lambardár in villages with three or more lambardárs.

(3). To remit the *ála-lambardári* cess in villages in which the appointment has ceased from kharíf following the vacancy.

(4). To resume all *sarpanchi ináms* from the death or dismissal of present incumbents.

(5). To give from Kharíf 1892, 81 *zamíndári ináms* of Rs. 20 each to selected headmen by *zails*, such *ináms* to be continued to selected headmen of that *zail*.

11. These proposals refer only to Tahsíl Gujrát, but should they meet with approval, I shall be prepared to submit proposals on the same lines for Tahsíls Phália and Khárián.

Statement showing proposed Ináms to take the place of Sarpanchi Ináms.

Zail.	Jama 1892.	Number of lambardárs, 1892.	Number of ála-lambardárs.	Cash value of ála-lambardari ináms.	Zamindari inams of Rs. 20 each to take the place of ala-lambardari inams. Total proposed. Number of grants.	Zamindari inams … Total proposed. Value in rupees.	Zamindari inams … Number to be given from Kharíf 1892. Number of grants.	Zamindari inams … Number to be given from Kharíf 1892. Value in rupees.	Remarks.
	Rs.			Rs.		Rs.		Rs.	
Daulatnagar	25,289	85	49	257	12	240	6	120	
Handu Gujrát	12,684	39	23	119	6	120	3	60	
Paláhi	41,654	135	77	409	20	400	10	200	
Chuhi Chuhán	17,312	65	38	167	8	160	4	80	
Chakri	12,834	58	34	127	6	120	3	60	
Gujar Kunjah	15,451	40	21	149	7	140	4	80	
Jat Kunjah	25,214	51	27	227	11	220	5	100	
Kaulanwála	17,022	49	29	165	8	160	4	80	
Mangowál	24,073	36	15	217	10	200	5	100	
Shadiwál	29,695	62	26	261	13	260	6	120	
Gujrát	38,552	105	45	357	17	340	9	180	
Suk	11,413	33	16	111	5	100	3	60	
Shekhpur	21,070	54	28	192	9	180	4	80	
Thata Músa	10,947	41	19	104	5	100	3	60	
Jalálpur...	34,467	98	52	325	16	320	8	160	
Dhul Mari	13,452	56	27	115	5	100	2	40	
Gungwál	9,201	36	17	78	4	80	2	40	
Total	3,60,403	1,043	543	3,380	162	3,240	81	1,620	

No. 772, dated Lahore, 13th December 1892.

From—M. W. FENTON, Esquire, C. S., Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

No. 3175, dated 16th November 1892, from Commissioner, Rawalpindi, with enclosures.

I AM directed to submit, in original, for the orders of Government, the correspondence noted in the margin, regarding the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gujrát Tahsíl of the Gujrát District, and to convey the following remarks of the Financial Commissioner.

2. In paragraph 2 of your letter No. 86, dated 19th October 1891, it was stated that the Settlement Officers concerned should be instructed to submit separate reports on the subject of the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system at the conclusion of their settlement operations. Subsequently in June last, permission was obtained from Government to instruct Settlement Officers that they might submit their reports on this subject *before* the conclusion of settlement operations at such times as might be convenient to them. I am now to ask that this unofficial permission may be confirmed by formal official orders. It is, in the Financial Commissioner's opinion, very desirable that Settlement Officers should deal with the question before they leave the district. If they have to defer the report till the conclusion of settlement operations there is some probability of their not being able to carry out the orders passed by Government (as in Gurdáspur). On the other hand, it is difficult to fix any definite time. It will be best to leave the time to the discretion of the Settlement Officer in each case.

3. Turning to the proposals now submitted for the sanction of Government, the arrangements may be briefly summarized as follows :—

(1) Ala-lambardárs to be abolished in all villages containing less than three lambardárs.

(2) Not more than one ála-lambardár to be retained in any village.

(3) Abolition to take effect from the death of existing incumbents.

(4) As each ála-lambardárship is thus abolished the *ála-lambardári* cess will concurrently cease to be levied in that village.

(5) The *ála-lambardári ináms* which have already been substituted for *ála-lambardári máfis* in accordance with the orders passed in the Gurdáspur case to be enjoyed by all ála-lambardárs for the time being.

(6) Upon the abolition of an ála-lambardárship the *inám* attached thereto will be converted into a *zamíndári inám*.

So far the proposals are in accordance with the arrangements adopted with the approval of Government in the Gurdsápur District. The main point for discussion in the present case is the method to be adopted for the conversion of *ála-lambardári* into *zamíndári ináms*.

4. The total value of the *ála-lambardári ináms* of the Gujrát Tahsíl is Rs. 3,380. Out of this amount *ináms* of the value of Rs. 2,065 will eventually become available for conversion into *zamíndári ináms*. The remaining Rs. 1,315 will continue until next settlement at any rate, to be enjoyed by ála-lambardárs and their successors in villages in which the system is not to be abolished. Of course the Rs. 2,065 will only become available very gradually. Captain Davies accordingly proposes that Rs. 1,620 be allotted in *zamíndári ináms* at once. Mr. Ibbetson considers this an unnecessary extravagance, and proposes that the *ináms* should be allotted from time to time as they become available, *i.e.*, as *ála-lambardári ináms* fall in. Mr. Ibbetson's proposal seems to the Financial Commissioner a good one, and he recommends it for sanction by Government. It will obviate the necessity of any system of keeping account of lapses and re-grants, and will thereby save much trouble to the District authorities. As in Gurdáspur, the *ináms* will be re-granted within the *zail*. In only one particular would the Financial Commissioner modify Mr. Ibbetson's proposals. Mr. Ibbetson would fix the *maximum* of each *inám* at Rs. 20. In Mr. Young's opinion the money would be much more usefully expended in granting substantial *ináms* of a less number than a large number not exceeding Rs. 20 each. In Gurdáspur, the average

value of the proposed *zamíndári ináms* will be Rs. 50. The Financial Commissioner would, therefore, fix the *maximum* in the present case—beyond which the Deputy Commissioner may not go without sanction—at Rs. 40. Commissioner might authorize a *maximum* up to Rs. 80. Even at the latter figure the *ináms* will be considerably below the average emoluments of a zaildár.

5. As proposed by the Settlement Officer and Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner recommends that the general *inám* rules (Rules 173 and 174 under Land Revenue Act) be extended to the Gujrát District.

6. The Financial Commissioner also thinks that the proposal that *ála-lambardári* cess should cease to be levied from the kharíf following the abolition of the office, as also the proposal that the balance of cess accruing after the death of the ála-lambardár be given to the successor in the lambardárship, may be approved as tending to uniformity of procedure.

7. In conclusion, the Financial Commissioner would ask not only that Captain Davies be authorized to make arrangements in the other two tahsíls of the Gujrát District, in accordance with the orders which may now be passed by Government, but also that the Financial Commissioner be allowed by Government to carry out arrangements in all the districts settled by Mr. Prinsep as far as may be on these lines.

No. 49, dated Lahore, 3rd March 1893.

From—R. G. Thomson, Esquire, Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab,
To—The Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

In reply to your letter No. 772 of the 13th December 1892, submitting proposals for the partial abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gujrát District, I am directed to convey the following remarks and instructions.

2. The Lieutenant-Governor agrees that Settlement Officers may be instructed to submit their reports on the subject of the abolition of the *ála-lambardári* system as soon as they are in a position to do so. It is unnecessary to postpone the report till the conclusion of settlement operations.

3. The Settlement Officer's proposals for the abolition or retention of ála-lambardárs in the Gujrat Tahsíl are sanctioned.

4. With reference to the remarks in paragraph 4 of your letter under reply in regard to the conversion of *ála-lambardári* into *zamíndári ináms*, I am to say that it is understood that the system proposed is as follows. For each *zail* the amount of the *ála-lambardári ináms* that will lapse will be ascertained. *Zamíndári ináms* to the same amount will be sanctioned for the *zail*, no *zamíndári inám* to exceed a certain fixed *maximum*. As each *ála-lambardári inám* lapses to Government the equivalent of it will be granted to one or other of the *zamíndári* inamdárs at the discretion of the Deputy Commissioner and within the limits fixed for each *zamíndári inám*. Nothing is to be granted to any *zamíndári* inamdár except as against an equivalent previous lapse to Government of *ála-lambardári inám*. If the proposals in the above sense have been rightly apprehended, I am to say that they have the approval of Government.

5. As to the *maximum* amount of the *zamíndári ináms*, I am to say that the Lieutenant-Governor does not consider it desirable to create a large number of inamdárs of this class. It is more advantageous to have a small number of such men, each one of whom will be a prominent man and known personally to the District Officers. The Lieutenant-Governor accordingly agrees with the Financial Commissioner that the *maximum* amount of each *zamíndári inám* should be fixed at Rs. 40 or, subject to the sanction of the Commissioner, at Rs. 80.

6. In regard to the proposals that *ála-lambardári* cess should cease to be levied from the kharíf following the abolition of the office, and that the balance of cess accruing after the death of the ála-lambardár should be given to the lambardár who succeeds him, I am to say that the Lieutenant-Governor considers that the cess should cease when the *ála-lambardári* ceases.

7. Subject to the above remarks, the Financial Commissioner's recommendations are accepted, and, as suggested in the 7th paragraph of your letter, arrangements in all districts settled by Mr. Prinsep may be carried out as far as possible on the same lines.

8. In conclusion, I am to request that a draft Notification extending the *inám* rules to the Gujrát District may be submitted for publication in the *Gazette*.

No. 1775, dated the 11th March 1893.

Endorsement by the Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

Copy of Punjab Government No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893, with copy of Financial Commissioner's No. 772, dated 13th December 1892, forwarded to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division, in reply to his No. 3175, dated 16th November 1892.

No. 171, dated 11th March 1893.

From—M. W. FENTON, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Revenue Secretary to Government, Punjab.

WITH reference to paragraph 8 of your letter No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893, I am directed to submit a draft Notification extending Rules 173 and 174 of the rules under the Land Revenue Act to the Gujrat District.

Notification No. 79, dated 28th March 1893.

With reference to Rule 172 of the rules under the Punjab Land Revenue Act (XVII of 1887), the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to extend and hereby extends Rules 173 and 174 of the rules under the said Act relating to inamdárs to the Gujrát District.

No. 1622, dated 13th June 1893.

From—S. S. THORBURN, Esquire, Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division,

To—M. W. FENTON, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

WITH reference to correspondence ending with this office No. 1290, dated 10th May 1893, regarding the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gujrát District, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Financial Commissioner, copy of a letter No. 108, dated 5th instant, from the Deputy Commissioner, Gujrát, and of my reply thereto, on the subject, in case my provisional instructions require modification in any particular.

Copy of a letter No. 108, dated 5th June 1893, from Baron J. BENTINCK, Deputy Commissioner, Gujrát, to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

WITH reference to your Circular No. 67-1202, dated 3rd May 1893, forwarding copy of Punjab Government Proceedings for March 1893, No. 45-52, Part A, on the subject of *ála-lambardári* system, I have the honour to solicit definite instructions as to whether the proposals regarding the abolition of ála-lambardárs, submitted by Captain Davies, which referred only to the Gujrát Tahsíl, apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Khárián and Phália Tahsíls also. Paragraph 3 of the Government Proceedings shows that they referred to Gujrát Tahsíl only.

2. By Notification No. 79 of the 28th March 1893, Rules 173 and 174 under the Punjab Land Revenue Act, relating to inámdárs have been extended to the whole district, and it seems, therefore, desirable that the proposals summarised in paragraph 3 of Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner's letter No. 772 of the 13th December last, may also be made applicable to the two other tahsíls of the district.

3. I also beg to enquire whether the vacancies in the post of ála-lambardárs in villages containing less than three lambardárs which had occurred before sanction to the rules in question was accorded are to be filled up as heretofore, or should be dealt with in accordance with the rules as now sanctioned, and are the vacancies in the Gujrát Tahsíl only to be filled up according to the new rules, and those in the other tahsíls irrespective of them?

4. I am also given to understand that mutation of *sarpanchi ináms*, in cases which occurred during settlement operations, have not yet been effected in favour of the successors to the office. It has, therefore, to be decided whether those *ináms* will lapse from the death of the original holders and be included in the *zamíndári ináms* as now proposed in each *zail*, or the present incumbents who have been appointed before the issue of these rules will continue to enjoy them till the term of their office. As this matter is of the greatest importance, I would beg the favour of your giving detailed and distinct instructions on the points set forth.

Copy of a letter No. 1577, dated 9th June 1893, from the Commissioner and Superintendent, Rávalpindi Division, to the Deputy Commissioner, Gujrát.

In reply to your No. 108, dated 5th instant, just received, I think the right instructions to give you are as follows :—

2. *Your para.* 1.—The orders given as to the future of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Gujrát Tahsíl are intended to apply also to Tahsíls Phália and Khárián.

Your para. 2.—The step here suggested by you has already been taken by me—Copy of my No. 1290, dated 10th May 1893, is enclosed.

Punjab Government Proceedings for March 1893, Nos. 45-52, Part A.

Your para. 3.—All vacancies in your district are to be governed by the principles of the orders given by Government in the case of the Gujrát Tahsíl.

Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner's No. 1815, dated 14th March 1893.

Your para. 4.—*Sarpanchi ináms* death vacancies which occurred during settlement should be dealt with according to the orders of Government even though subsequently issued, *i. e.*, the *ináms* lapse and are included in the *zamíndári inám* arrangements now sanctioned.

3. When orders are received on the proposed rules submitted to Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner under cover of my No. 1290, dated 10th ultimo, of which, as stated in last paragraph, a copy is enclosed, I trust all obscurity will be removed, meanwhile, I think you may act as if the rules proposed by Captain Davies as amended and enlarged by me, were sanctioned.

4. A copy of your letter under reply and of this reply will be sent to Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner in case my provisional instructions require modification in any particular.

No. 147 C., dated 29th June 1893.

From—M. W. Fenton, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,
To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

W. M. Young, Esquire, C.S.I.

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 1622, dated 13th June 1893, regarding the *ála-lambardári ináms* in the Gujrát District, I am directed to say that the Financial Commissioner now formally sanctions the conditions as communicated to you in this office letter No. 3928, dated 5th June 1893.

2. These conditions should be printed as an Appendix to the Settlement Report.

3. The instructions communicated by you to the Deputy Commissioner, Gujrát, in your letter No. 1577, dated 9th June 1893 are, I am to say, correct.

Conditions and limitations (Rule 173 *Land Revenue Rules) applicable to inamdárs in the Gujrát District.*

1. In villages containing three or more ála-lambardárs, appointments to the post of ála-lambardár will continue to be made, but not more than one ála-lambardár will eventually be retained in any one village.

2. In villages containing fewer than three lambardárs, the post of ála-lambardár will be abolished from the date of the death or dismissal of the existing ála-lambardár.

3. Upon the abolition of the post of ála-lambardár in any village, the *ála-lambardári* cess will cease to be levied in such village.

4. In villages in which ála-lambardárs continue to be appointed, the holder of the office will receive the *ála-lambardári inám* (if any) existing in the village.

5. In villages where new appointments to the post will cease under Rule 2, existing incumbents will continue to receive the *ála-lambardári inám* existing in the village, while they continue to hold the post of ála-lambardar. Upon the abolition of the post the *ála-lambardári inám* will be resumed.

6. On the resumption of any *ála-lambardári inám* under Rule 5, an equivalent sum will be granted as a *zamíndári inám*.

7. When the resumed *inám* is insufficient in the opinion of the Deputy Commissioner to form an adequate *zamíndári inám*, the Deputy Commissioner may, on the occurrence of further resumptions, subject to the limits mentioned in Rule 8, allot a further amount as *zamíndári inám* to the inámdár.

8. The Deputy Commissioner may allot resumed *ála-lambardári ináms* to any one *zamíndári inámdár* up to a limit of Rs. 40; subject to the sanction of the Commissioner this limit may be extended to Rs. 80.

9. On the resumption of an *ála-lambardári inám* the procedure will be as follows :—

A resumption statement will be prepared and submitted for the village in which the grant existed as in the case of other lapsed and resumed assignments (paragraph 58, Revenue Circular 37).

A statement showing an equal amount of revenue to be released from the village of the inamdár will also be prepared and submitted in the same way.

10. Under Punjab Government Notification No. 79, dated 28th March 1893, Rules 173 and 174 of the rules under the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887, apply to *zamíndári ináms* constituted under these rules.

11. *Zamíndári ináms* shall not be conferred on existing ála-lambardárs or zaildárs without the sanction of the Financial Commissioner.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE GUJRANWALA DISTRICT.

No. $\frac{3219}{B. V. 9}$, dated 22nd November 1894.

From—Lieut.-Col. J. A. L. MONTGOMERY, Officiating Commissioner and Superintendent, Rawalpindi Division.

To—R. SYKES, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

* No. 277, dated 17th November 1894, and enclosures.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for orders, a report* submitted by Mr. O'Dwyer on the *ála-lambárdári* system in the Gujránwála District. I concur in all his proposals.

2. I do not know from what paper the Deputy Commissioner obtains his opinion that in the Gujrát District the full number of inámdárs is appointed at once. I do not read the rules in this sense, and I entirely agree with Mr. O'Dwyer that it would be wrong to appoint the two or three inámdárs prescribed for a *zail* simultaneously, and to let them scramble for lapses as they take place. A copy of a letter (No. 2718 dated 27th September 1894) written by me to the Deputy Commissioner of Gujrát, herewith attached, will show that I took the same view when the Deputy Commissioner of Gujrát submitted his proposals a short time ago. I would go further now and suggest that the Deputy Commissioner should be requested to fix at once approximately the amount of each *inám* and that it should be a rule that the larger *inám* should be completed first in favour of the best man, the others going afterwards to those who are considered next most worthy of the reward.

3. I hope that early orders will be passed on this reference.

No. 277, dated 17th November 1894.

From—M. F. O'DWYER, Esquire, Deputy Commissioner, Gujránwála,

To—Col. J. A. L. MONTGOMERY, Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

IN compliance with your letter No. 2923, dated 22nd October, and with reference to paragraph 7 of Punjab Government letter No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893 (Proceedings 45-52 March 1893), I have now the honour to submit proposals regarding the future treatment of the *ála-lambárdári* system in this district.

2. In the correspondence quoted above, the lines on which the question should be dealt with in the Gujrát District were fully laid down, and in para. 7 of the Government letter it was directed that "arrangements in all districts settled by Mr. Prinsep may be carried out as far as possible on the same lines." The circumstances of this district and Gujrát in this respect are so similar, that I cannot do better than suggest that the rules sanctioned for Gujrát be applied *mutatis mutandis* here with only one exception which is explained further on.

3. My proposals then based on the Gujrát rules are :—

1. Ala-lambardárs to be abolished in all villages containing lesss than three lambardárs.
2. Not more than one ála-lambardár to be retained in any village.

Note.—There are only 2 villages in this district which have more than one ála-lambardár.

3. Abolition in (1) and (2) to take effect from the death of existing incumbents.
4. As each *ála-lambardári* is thus abolished, the *ála-lambardári* cess will concurrently cease to be levied in that village.
5. The *ála-lambardári ináms* which have already during the re-assessment been substituted for *ála-lambardári mafís* granted originally by Mr. Prinsep to be enjoyed by all ála-lambardárs for the time being.
6. Upon the abolition of an *ála-lambardári* the *inám* attached thereto will be converted into a *zamíndári inám*.
7. The lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms* to be given to one or more inámdárs selected by the Deputy Commissioner within the *zail* up to a limit of Rs. 60 in the case of any one inámdár.

These rules have been so fully discussed in the case of Gujrát that further explanation is unnecessary. It only remains to notice what will be the ultimate result of their working. This is shown in the annexed statement.

4. There are 1,237 estates in the district excluding the new colonies. In 955 of these there are ála-lambardárs existing. The value of their *ináms* as fixed at re-assessment is Rs. 6,366. By the application of the above rules the *ála-lambardári* system will

be maintained in 164 villages, in which there are 3 or more lambardárs, for the term of settlement. The *ináms* in these villages amount to Rs. 2,180. In 771 villages the office will be abolished as existing incumbents die off, and there will eventually be a sum of Rs. 4,186, available for *zamíndári ináms*. The inámdárs will be selected by *zails* by the Deputy Commissioner as sums become available by lapse of *ála-ambardári ináms*. To start with, one inámdár will be selected in each *zail*, who will receive all such lapses up to the limit sanctioned or fixed by the Deputy Commissioner. When the amount of the lapsed *ináms* reaches that limit, then another inámdár in the *zail* will be selected who will receive all subsequent lapses up to the limit, and so on till the whole amount has been absorbed.

5. The above proposals differ from those sanctioned for Gujrát in this respect, that in Gujrát *the full number* of inámdárs is appointed *at once* and every lapse that occurs is given to one or other of them by the Deputy Commissioner, while my proposal is to appoint only one inámdár at a time as funds become available. However the Gujrát system may work in that district, I am convinced that its application here would lead to unseemly scramble for the loaves and fishes by the rival inámdárs every time that one of the 771 *ála-lambardári ináms* become available. The Deputy Commissioner will be flooded with petitions in which each aspirant will dwell on his own merits and do all he can to blacken the character of his rival. We must, I fear, take it for granted that the spirit of jealousy and rivalry is so strong among the particular class from whom our inámdárs would be drawn that an occasion of this kind in which each man naturally thinks he has as good a claim as his rival, will enevitably provoke ill-feeling and the people have already sufficient causes of quarrel in their own social system without our providing them with more. It may be urged that the Gujrát system of making a selection from among all the inámdárs of the *zail* every time a lapse occurs will create a spirit of healthy competition among them, and act as an incentive to good work. With the example of the friction generated in every village by the selection of ála-lambardárs before us, I think a much more probable result will be the increase of faction and discord. For these reasons, I would strongly urge that only one inámdár be selected in each *zail* to start with, and that no other be appointed till the first has received an *inám* up to the amount fixed or as near it as is possible.

6. The amount which will eventually become available in each *zail* is shown in the last column but one of the statement, and in the last column I have entered the number of *zamindarí inams* which, I think, should *eventually* be created in each *zail*. To save future disputes and uncertainty I think the *ináms* should, as nearly as possible, be of equal value *within any one zail*. Otherwise, suppose the total amount that will ultimately lapse to be Rs. 45 and the limit to be Rs. 40, there is the danger that the first man selected will receive all lapses up to Rs. 40, leaving only Rs. 5 available for the next man appointed. Complete equality is, however, out of the question; for example, suppose in the above case the general rule is to have two equal *ináms* (Rs. 22-8 each) and the first inámdár appointed to have already received lapses amounting to Rs. 20, another lapse amounting to Rs. 7 occurs, I think he should receive all of it, so as to avoid the complications sure to ensue if two inámdárs had to realise from the same village and divide the amount.

7. I have proposed a limit of Rs. 60 because, with reference to the amount that will ultimately be available in each *zail* that seems the most suitable limit. To multiply the number of inámdárs unnecessarily only increases local jealousies by providing more frequent occasions for rivalry and disputes. There are now 44 zaildárs in the district, and if my proposals are accepted there will be 86 inámdárs or an average of 2 per *zail*, which seems sufficient and their emoluments will ultimately average Rs. 49 per man. Considering that the average *zaildári inám* is Rs. 201, I do not think this can be considered excessive. The favour of early orders is requested to enable the new arrangements to be brought into force this cold weather.

Copy of a letter No. 2718, dated 27th September 1894, from the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division, to the Deputy Commissioner, Gujrát.

On examining the statements forwarded with your No. 194, dated 12th instant, I find that you recommend new *ináms* in each tahsíl to the following amounts :—

Tahsíl.	No. of inámdárs.	Amount of ináms to be now given.
Khárián	31	181
Phália...	28	165
Gujrát	35	427

In making recommendations you have followed exactly the list of deserving names recorded by Captain Davies, a copy of which was sent to this office with your No. 105 dated 31st May 1893. In this you have done quite right.

2. But I think you have made a mistake in giving *ináms* at once to all the persons named by Captain Davies. The whole previous correspondence shows that it is intended that each inámdár should have a substantial salary. This salary was ordinarily not to be more than Rs. 40; but this limit may be extended to Rs. 80. It is also

necessary that the amount of lapsed *máfis* be utilised in the *zail* and not to be given outside it. I have the honour to request that you will inform me if by your proposals each inámdár only gets the lapsed *máfis* of his own *zail*. I also think that it would be best where more than one name is given by Captain Davies for a *zail* that the first lapses should go only to the more deserving of the candidates until his allowance is made up to Rs. 30 or Rs. 40. After that subsequent resumptions should go to some other person of the *zail* who has been noted as worthy by the Settlement Collector, or who appears to be deserving of the distinction. I, therefore, herewith return the statements furnished by you for further examination and compliance with the above instructions.

No. 46, dated 4th January 1895.

From—R. Sykes, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

With reference to your letter No. $\frac{3219}{B. V. 9}$, of 22nd November 1894, regarding the *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the Gujránwála district, I am directed to say that the Financial Commissioner approves generally of all the proposals set forth in this correspondence. On one point I am to ask for further information. It is noticed that in several instances if the amount available in the *zail* for *zamíndári ináms* is distributed among the number of inámdárs shown in the 13th column of the statement submitted by the Deputy Commissioner the amount of the *ináms* must in some cases exceed Rs. 80, which is the maximum amount allowed by the rules.

Copy of a letter No. 71, dated 12th January 1895, from M. F. O'Dwyer, Esquire, Deputy Commissioner, Gujránwála, to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

In reply to your endorsement No. $\frac{115}{B. V. 9}$, dated 8th January 1895, I have the honour to explain that owing to an error in my office, column 12 of the statement was made to show the totals of columns 7 and 11 instead of the sum of column 9, *ináms* that have already lapsed, and of column 11, *ináms* which will lapse under the proposed rules. A copy of the statement as corrected is now submitted, and it will be seen that the amount of the *zamíndári inám* will in no case exceed Rs. 80.

Zamíndári Ináms proposed in the Gujránwála District.

1	1 (a)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Tahsil.	Serial number.	Zail.	Total number of villages in zail.	Number of villages in which ála-lambardári ináms exist.	Amount of ála-lambardári ináms.	Villages in which ála-lambardári ináms retained.	Amount of such ináms (column 6.	Villages in which ála-lambardári ináms resumed.	Amount of inám resumed (column 8).	Villages in which ála-lambardári inám will lapse on death of present incumbent.	Amount of inám which will thus lapse.	Total of columns 9 and 11, *i.e.*, total amount available for zamíndári inám.	Number of zamíndári ináms proposed.	Remarks.
Gujranwala.	1	Arúp	20	20	152	7	59	...	...	13	93	93	2	
	2	Fírozwála	21	14	159	3	83	...	...	11	76	76	2	
	3	Gujránwála	30	21	190	5	72	...	...	16	118	118	2	
	4	Mírálíwála	25	23	176	2	42	...	...	21	134	134	2	
	5	Mandiála	19	17	195	7	128	...	...	10	67	67	2	
	6	Mán	23	17	123	5	61	1	6	11	56	62	1	
	7	Ludhewála	14	12	133	5	90	...	...	7	43	43	1	
	8	Butála	25	20	114	4	36	...	...	16	78	78	2	
	9	Chahil	28	26	178	5	76	2	6	19	96	102	2	
	10	Chaba Sandhuán	36	29	192	5	68	1	3	23	121	124	2	
	11	Naushahra	36	26	141	7	57	...	...	19	84	84	2	
	12	Karyál	30	28	123	2	33	1	7	25	83	90	2	
	13	Mangoke	33	29	164	6	78	...	...	23	86	86	2	
	14	Majju Chak	34	27	141	3	32	...	...	24	109	109	2	
	15	Kámoke	26	15	110	2	20	...	...	13	90	90	2	
	16	Emínabad	31	19	113	2	23	1	2	16	88	90	2	
	17	Gunnaur	24	19	138	2	19	2	12	15	107	119	2	
		Total	455	362	2,542	72	977	8	36	282	1,529	1,565	32	

WAZIRABAD.	1	Sohdra	32	27	161	5	41	2	12	20	108	120	2
	2	Jaura	20	18	134	2	31	3	13	13	90	103	2
	3	Ghakkhar	17	15	173	3	55	1	7	11	111	118	2
	4	Dhaunkal	16	13	149	3	71	...	...	10	78	78	2
	5	Wázírabad	24	20	176	7	87	...	...	13	89	89	2
	6	Baddoke	16	16	152	6	104	...	...	10	48	48	1
	7	Ahmadanagar	20	18	135	6	62	1	7	11	66	73	2
	8	Saroke	25	21	166	8	107	1	5	12	54	59	1
	9	Salhoke	18	14	103	4	33	1	6	9	64	70	2
	10	Manchar	28	18	95	1	5	...	...	17	90	90	2
	11	Noinwála	22	20	121	3	29	...	...	17	92	92	2
	12	Rámnagar	28	23	123	5	67	...	...	18	56	56	1
		Total	266	223	1,688	53	692	9	50	161	946	996	21
HAFIZABAD.	1	Vanike	52	34	254	3	45	...	...	31	209	209	4
	2	Kaula Tarar	45	28	149	2	11	...	...	26	138	138	3
	3	Rámki	29	29	216	2	23	...	...	27	193	193	4
	4	Thatta Mának	26	21	114	2	10	1	2	18	102	104	2
	5	Jalálpur	46	35	233	4	63	1	5	30	165	170	3
	6	Pindi Bhatián	69	49	183	5	43	...	...	44	140	140	3
	7	Sukheke	31	16	116	2	60	1	6	13	50	56	1
	8	Kassise	29	25	122	2	14	...	...	23	108	108	2
	9	Háfizabad	44	32	171	3	37	...	...	29	134	134	3
	10	Kassoke	34	20	109	2	22	...	...	18	87	87	2
		Total	405	289	1,667	27	328	3	13	259	1,326	1,339	27

Zamíndárí Ináms proposed in the Gujránwála District—concluded.

1	1 (a)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Tahsíl.	Serial number.	Zail.	Total number of villages in zail.	Number of villages in which ála-lambárdari ináms exist.	Amount of ála-lambardári ináms.	Villages in which á l a - lambardári ináms retained.	Amount of such ináms (column 6.)	Villages in which á l a - lambardári ináms resumed.	Amount of inám resumed (column 8).	Villages in which á l a - lambardári inám will lapse on death of present incumbent.	Amount of inám which will thus lapse.	Total of columns 9 and 11, *i.e.*, total amount available for zamindári inám.	Number of zamindári ináms proposed.	Remarks.
Khangah Dogran.	1	Chuharkána	22	15	114	4	61	...	...	11	53	53	1	
	2	Gájáina Nán	27	24	116	2	23	...	...	22	93	93	2	
	3	Mánánwála	4	3	29	1	25	...	...	2	4	4	...	
	4	Bhikhi	28	13	44	1	6	...	...	12	38	38	1	
	5	Mirza Virkán	30	26	166	4	68	...	...	22	98	98	2	
		Total	111	81	469	12	183	...	...	69	286	286	6	
		Total District	1,237	955	6,366	164	2,180	20	99	771	4,087	4,186	86	

Endorsement No. $\frac{166}{B.V.9}$, dated 15th January 1895, by the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

Copy of above, with statement in original, forwarded to R. Sykes, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab, with reference to his No. 46, dated 4th instant.

No. 748, dated 6th February 1895.

From—R. Sykes, Esquire, Officiating Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

W. M. Young, Esquire, C. S. I.

In reply to your No. $\frac{166}{B.V.9}$, dated 15th January 1895, I am directed to convey the sanction of the Financial Commissioner to the revised statement submitted therewith of *zámíndárí ináms* proposed in the Gujránwála District.

The statement submitted with your No. $\frac{3219}{B.V.9}$, dated 22nd November 1894, is returned herewith.

No. 33, dated 15th February 1895.

With reference to Rule 172 of the rules under the Punjab Land Revenue Act (XVII of 1887), the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to extend, and hereby extends, Rules 173 and 174 of the rules under the said Act, relating to inámdárs, to the Gujránwála district.

Extract from the Final Settlement Report of the Gujránwála District.

Ala-lambardári ináms.

188. The most troublesome of all forms of revenue-free grants and the most fruitful source of discord and litigation have been the grants varying from 2 to 75 acres, made at last settlement under Mr. Prinsep's order, generally, from the common land where available, and in other cases from individual holdings to the ála-lambardár or sarpanch, who was appointed in nearly every village irrespective of the number of lambardárs. Where common land was allotted the original grantee was put in possession at the time without objection from the shareholders and generally proceeded to improve and bring the land under cultivation.

As long as he or his heirs continued to hold the office and the *inám* attached no serious difficulty arose, but when on his death an outsider was appointed ála-lambardár, and having received, *ipso facto*, mutation of the *inám*, claimed possession of the land, the trouble began. So, too, as land became more valuable, the village community began to look on the appropriation of a substantial block of the *shámilát* by the ála-lambardár with a jealous eye, and suits to oust him or partition the area became common.

The history of this thorny subject is given in full in "Financial Commissioner's Selections"* and the upshot of the discussion which took place when Mr. Prinsep's settlements came under revision was that abolition of the office of ála-lambardár was sanctioned, as vacancies occur, in all villages with less than three lambardárs, unless there are special reasons for maintaining the office, while in villages with three or more lambardárs the office will be retained. At the same time it was ordered that the *máfi* holdings should now be assessed to land revenue, and the assessment, provided it did not exceed one per cent. on the *jama* of the estate, should go to the ála-lambardár as a cash *inám* in cases where the office was maintained subject to reconsideration at next settlement; and where the office was abolished should be utilised for the creation of *zamíndári ináms*. These orders have been given effect to in the new assessment. The ála-lambardár as such has, therefore, no longer any rights in the land beyond receiving the assessment, and where he is still in possession, he has been shown as the tenant of the village community or of the owner of the land. This will enable the proprietor, whether the whole village or a single individual, to levy rent from him and to eject him if necessary, while it gives the ála-lambardár or his heirs the right to claim compensation for disturbance or improvements in case of ejectment. In cases of partition during settlement the area has generally been allotted to the ála-lambardár, if not in excess of his share, and this procedure might well be followed in future partitions.

* Now Series No. 20.

See (1) Punjab Government letter No. 31, dated 1st February 1890.

See (2) Punjab Government letter No. 49, dated 3rd March 1893.

The amount available for the creation of future *sufaid-poshi ináms* by the resumption of *ála-lambardári ináms* in villages with only one or two lambardárs will appear from the followi ng statement:—

Tahsíl.	Total value of ála-lambárdári ináms.	Value of ináms to be retained for term of settlement.	Value of ináms that have already lapsed.	Value of ináms that will lapse on death of alá-lambardár.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Gujránwála	2,542	950	14	1,578
Wazírabad	1,760	708	37	1,015
Háfizabad	1,667	284	13	1,370
Khángah Dográn	469	177	...	292
Total District	6,438	2,119	64	4,255

It has been proposed to utilise this amount for the creation of 86 *sufaid-poshi ináms* —one or more in each *zail*—with a limit of Rs. 80, and averaging eventually Rs. 50 each.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE SIALKOT DISTRICT.

No. $\frac{1880}{B.V.9}$, dated 19th June 1895.

From—S. S. THORBURN, Esquire, Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division,
To—R. SYKES, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the orders of the Financial Commissioner, a copy of Settlement Collector Siálkot's No. 174 S, dated 9th April, and annexures, containing his proposals for the abolition of the appointment of ála-lambardár in the Siálkot District.

2. The Settlement Collector submits a set of rules which generally follow the frame of those sanctioned for the Gujrát District, and are almost identical with those submitted for the Gujránwála District. Generally they amount to this: ála-lambardárs will be retained only in villages containing not less than three lambardárs, abolitions being gradually effected. As reductions occur, the *ináms lambardári* thus saved will, with the present *chaudhriat ináms*, be absorbed and will be bestowed on deserving zamíndárs in the form of *ináms zamíndári*, of which 266 are proposed. As to the practical application of these rules, the Settlement Collector shows that he has presently available for immediate bestowal as *zamíndári ináms* the following sums:—

Alá-lambardárí ináms Rs. 1,619 in 204 estates where the appointment of ála-lambardár is vacant.

Chaudhriat ináms Rs. 409 in 9 estates where the appointment of chaudhri is vacant.

Ultimately the following sums will become available as existing incumbents die off:—

Ala-lambardári ináms	Rs. 7,842	in 1,717	estates.
Chaudhriat ináms	„ 2,406	„ 78	„.
Total	... 10,248		

Thus the total sum that will finally be available for *zamíndiri ináms* is Rs. 12,276, to be distributed among 266 *zamíndári inámdars* divided into 4 classes.

3. In bestowing the *zamíndári ináms*, Settlement Collector proposes to begin with the first class making up as many *ináms* as funds will allow of, and gradually as money is available to work downwards in the classification. To this end, he has drawn up a scheme which he has left with the Deputy Commissioner, containing the names of men he would recommend for *ináms* when it is possible to bestow them.

4. I support all the Settlement Collector's proposals except in a few particular in which they appear to me too elaborate for easy working by the Deputy Commissioner of Siálkot, the heaviest worked district in the division. I would also point out that it will take 20 years for the rules now to be sanctioned to come fully into force, by which time the new re-assessment will be again revisable. Money will only gradually become available as existing ála-lambardárs whose offices are to be extinguished and chaudhris holding *chaudhriat ináms*, die off.

5. As already stated, the rules proposed for Siálkot almost exactly follow those proposed for Gujránwála. They generally have my support, but I would suggest the following slight amendments and additions:—

(1). In rule (*b*) between the words "will be" and "appointed," I would insert the words "retained or". The whole rule would then run thus:—

(*b*). Only one ála-lambardár will be retained or appointed in each revenue estate, where there are three or more adná-lambardárs.

(2). And I would suggest the addition of the two following rules which are to some extent based on those sanctioned in your No. 3928 of 5th June 1893 for the Gujrát District.

(*h*). *Zamíndári ináms* shall not be conferred on ála-lambardárs or zaildárs; and in no case shall one man hold more than one *inám*.

(*i*). Rules 173 and 174 under the Land Revenue Act shall apply to the inámdárs of the Siálkot District.

The above two additional rules are necessary to prevent abuses and make it clear that the ordinary rules for the appointment, removal, &c., of zaildárs shall govern the case of inámdárs. We must keep before us the fact that an over-worked Collector, as the Deputy Commissioner of Siálkot is, has to rush through much of his work and must be safe-guarded from mistakes as much as possible.

6. In paras. 5 and 6 of his letter, the Settlement Collector explains that eventually Rs. 12,276 will, as already briefly shown in paragraph 2 above, annually be available for distribution in *ináms*, the number of which he would fix at Rs. 266 for the district and at from 44 to 73 per tahsíl. He would also classify the inámdárs into 4 grades of

21 @	80.		
64 ,,	60.		
92 ,,	60	...	40.
89 ,,	40	...	30.

He further proposes to promote holders from one grade to a higher as opportunity occurs. To work properly such an elaborate system of patronage, the Collector should both have some leisure for thought and inquiry, both incompatible with the high pressure at which he works and he should also have as great local knowledge as the late Settlement Collector, but such knowledge is unattainable by any Collector even were he to remain in Siálkot for five years. The system, therefore, cannot be worked properly, and is, in my opinion, too elaborate and wants simplification to be practicable. The number of *ináms*, 266, appears to have been fixed with reference to the Settlement Collector's list of deserving men : but a third or perhaps half of those men will be dead before money falls in to give them their *ináms*. It thus seems to me unnecessary to rigidly adhere to the number 266. I recommend for acceptance in preference to the complicated graded system proposed that either there should be one rate of *inám*, *viz.*, Rs. 50 with 245 inámdárs, or two grades only, namely 20 men at Rs. 80 and 220 at Rs. 50 each. By this means the system of promotions from grade to grade which would cause much intrigue and jealousy will be largely obviated.

7. I further suggest that the Financial Commissioner when passing orders should send me a complete set of the approved rules with an authorised translation in Urdu, and that the correspondence, or at least the rules, be printed, and form an appendix to the Final Settlement Report.

8. I regret that this should have been delayed in my office chiefly owing to press of work connected with the annual excise and income-tax reports, and the Chitral Expedition, and partly to its having been accidentally overlooked when the press of work lately slackened.

Copy of a letter No. 174 S, dated 9th April 1895, from Captain J. R. Dunlop-Smith, Settlement Collector, Siálkot, to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

In compliance with the instructions regarding the submission of a report on the *ála-lambardári* system of this district, contained in the correspondence ending with your No. $\frac{3148}{B. V. 9}$, dated 16th November 1894, I have the honour to submit the proposals contained in the following paragraphs. Sanction to the re-organization of the *zaildári* agency has not yet been received, but as I am about to leave the district, it is impossible to delay this Report any longer. I have therefore, in framing my proposals, proceeded on the assumption that the proposed new *zails* will be approved.

2. The following proposals are cast on very much the same lines as those for Tahsíl Gujrát and resemble those recently submitted for Gujránwála. The rules I submit for sanction are :—

(*a*). The post of ála-lambardár will be abolished in all villages with less than three adna-lambardárs.

(*b*). Only one ála-lambardár will be (retained or) appointed in each revenue estate where there are three or more adna-lambardárs.

(*c*). Reductions under rules (*a*) and (*b*) will take effect only from the death of the existing incumbents.

(*d*). As each individual *ála-lambardári* comes under reduction the *ála-lambardári* cess will cease to be levied.

(*e*). *Ala-lambardári ináms* which have already, during re-assessment, been substituted for *ála-lambardári máfis*, granted originally by Mr. Prinsep, are to be enjoyed by all ála-lambardárs for the time being.

(*f*). Upon the abolition of an *ála-lambardári* appointment in any village the *inám* attached thereto will be absorbed in the general fund of the *zail* in which the village is situated from which the *sofed-poshi ináms* are to be met.

(*g*). All lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms* and certain grants dating from the last Settlement of the nature of *inám chaudhriat* will be funded by *zails*, and from this fund one or more *ináms* will be constituted which will be given to deserving zamíndárs who will be selected by the Deputy Commissioner. The number and amount of these *ináms* will vary with the income of the fund in each *zail*, but the maximum amount of any one *inám* will not exceed Rs. 80, and the minimum amount will not be less than Rs. 30 per annum.

3. There are at present 2,525 revenue estates in this district. In 205 of these no *ála-lambardári ináms* of any kind exist either because no ála-lambardárs have ever been appointed or because no *ináms* have been attached to *ála-lambardári* appointments. We have, therefore, to deal with only 2,320 estates. The details of these are given in Appendix A, attached to this Report. Three hundred and ninety-nine of these have three or more ordinary lambardárs, therefore, the *ináms* in these estates will not be available. In 204 of the remainder, the ála-lambardárs' apppointments are vacant and have not been filled up. Their *ináms*, therefore, amounting to Rs. 1,619 are available at once. In the remaining 1,717 estates, the *ináms* amounting to Rs. 7,842 will not be available until the present ála-lambardárs die. This amount will thus be available by degrees.

4. The old fashioned *zamindári ináms*, which were described by the general term of *chaudhriat inám*, exist only in 87 estates in the district. Appendix B gives the details by tahsíls. Of the 87 *ináms*, only 9 are at present available. These carry a value Rs. 409. The remaining 78, value Rs, 2,406, will be available by degrees as the present assignees die.

5. The following table shows concisely the amount of money available for the fund from which the new *sofed-poshi ináms* will be paid :—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Amount of Inams now available.			Amount of Inams gradually available in the future.			Total amount of Inams column 2-7.		
Tahsil.	Ala-Lambardari.	Chaudhriat.	Total.	Ala-Lambardari.	Chaudhriat.	Total.	Ala-Lambardari.	Chaudhriat.	Total.
Zafarwál	460	...	460	1,527	531	2,058	1,987	531	2,518
Raya	83	50	133	1,255	721	1,976	1,338	771	2,109
Pasrúr	480	...	480	1,529	103	1,632	2,009	103	2,112
Siálkot	421	281	702	2,111	610	2,721	2,532	891	3,423
Daska	175	78	253	1,420	441	1,861	1,595	519	2,114
District ...	1,619	409	2,028	7,842	2,406	10,248	9,461	2,815	12,276

6. I have now drawn up a register showing by *zails* the amounts now available, the amounts that will gradually become available in the future, the number and amounts of the proposed *ináms*, and the names of the persons who, in my opinion, should receive the different *ináms*. This register will be made over to the Deputy Commissioner who will have to pass the necessary orders when the orders of Government are received on this report. The following table is an extract of the register :—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
			Proposed Sufed poshi ináms.					
Tahsil.	Total amount available for ináms.	Average amount per zail.	1st class at Rs. 80.	2nd class at Rs. 60.	3rd class between Rs. 60 and Rs. 40.	4th class between Rs. 40 and Rs. 30.	Total number of ináms	Average amount per inám.
Zafarwál	2,518	179-13-0	4	16	16	17	53	47-8-0
Raya	2,109	150-10-0	4	11	18	11	44	47-15-0
Pasrúr	2,112	162-7-0	3	7	21	18	49	43-1-0
Siálkot	3,423	190-2-0	7	20	19	27	73	46-14-0
Daska	2,114	162-9-0	3	10	18	16	47	44-15-0
District ...	12,276	170-8-0	21	64	92	89	266	46-2-0

The large amount available in Siálkot is chiefly owing to the lavish way in which the *chaudhriat ináms* were given to Bajwat in previous settlements.

7. I propose that the men selected for *ináms* of the first class receive their *ináms* at once or as much of them as are available. As the rest of the money falls in it will go to make up the first class *ináms* to its full amount. When that is up to its full amount, the 2nd class inámdár will be appointed and so on. For example :—

In the rich Jandiála *zail* of Zafarwál there are one *inám* each of the 1st and 2nd class, two of the 3rd class at Rs. 52 and Rs. 40, respectively, and two of the 4th class at Rs. 30. But the amount now available in Jandiála is only Rs. 14. This will be given at once to the most deserving of the five men I have selected. When by deaths or dismissals his *inám* rises to Rs. 80, the next inámdár of the 2nd class will be appointed. When his *inám* rises to Rs. 60, the inámdár of the 3rd class who is eventually to draw Rs. 52 will be appointed, and so on.

8. If the proposal contained in the preceding paragraph be approved, I shall be able to appoint at once only one inámdár in each *zail* of Zafarwál. In no less than 7 of the Raya *zails* there is no money available just now. In 6 others one, and in 1 other two inámdárs can be appointed. In Pasrúr there is as yet no money for one *zail*. In 4 *zails* two inámdárs each, and in the remaining 8 one each can be nominated. In 2 of the Siálkot *zails* three inámdárs each can be appointed now and one each in the other 16. In 3 of the Daska *zails* there is no money available. In 1 *zail* two inámdárs and in the other 9 *zails* one each can be appointed at once.

9. As mentioned above, I have left a register giving the names of persons who, I consider, should receive the different *ináms*. Where the *ináms* are available it will perhaps be as well that the men I have selected should be appointed. In all other cases the Deputy Commissioner should have discretion to appoint whom he likes after considering my nominations. The register will be kept as "confidential."

10. In conclusion, I have the honour to ask for very early orders on these proposals.

APPENDIX A.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Tahsil.	Number of zails.	Number of revenue estates.	Number of estates in which there is no inám available owing to their never having had an ála-lambardár or other cause.	Estates in which ála-lamardári ináms exist.		Estates in which ináms will be retained in perpetuity.		Estates in which there is no ála-lambardár at present and the inám is therefore available.		Estates in which the ináms will be available only on death of present ála-lambardár.		Total of columns 9 to 12.		Remarks.
				No.	Value.	No.	Value.	No.	Value.	No.	Value.	No.	Value.	
					Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.	
Zafarwál	14	535	28	507	2,589	59	602	49	460	399	1,527	448	1,987	
Raya	14	492	109	383	2,726	121	1,388	13	83	249	1,255	262	1,338	
Pasrúr	13	474	13	461	2,661	56	652	59	480	346	1,529	405	2,009	
Siálkot	18	681	37	644	3,534	96	1,002	56	421	492	2,111	548	2,532	
Daska	13	343	18	325	2,892	67	1,297	27	175	231	1,420	258	1,595	
Total of district ...	72	2,525	205	2,320	14,402	399	4,941	204	1,619	1,717	7,842	1,921	9,461	

APPENDIX B.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
TAHSIL.	Number of zails.	Number of revenue estates.	Number of estates in which there is no chaudhriat inám.	Estates in which chaudhriat ináms exist.		Estates in which the chaudhriat ináms will be retained in perpetuity.		Estates in which the chaudhriat inám is at present available.		Estates in which the chaudhriat inám will be available only on death of present incumbent.		Total of columns 9 to 12.		REMARKS.
				No.	Value.	No.	Value.	No.	Value.	No.	Value.	No.	Value.	
					Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.	
Zafarwál	14	535	505	29	531	...	...	...	...	29	531	29	531	
Raya	14	492	467	25	771	...	...	3	50	22	721	25	771	
Pasrúr	13	474	470	4	103	...	...	...	...	4	103	4	103	
Siálkot	18	681	658	22	891	...	...	5	281	17	610	22	891	
Daska	13	343	336	7	519	...	...	1	78	6	441	7	519	
Total of district	72	2,525	2,436	87	2,815	...	...	9	409	78	2,406	87	2,815	

No. 3836, dated 10th July 1895.

From—R. Sykes, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—Commissioner and Superintendent Ráwalpindi Division.

With reference to your letter No. $\frac{1880}{B. V. 7}$, of the 19th June 1895, I am to ask you to be good enough to refer me to any correspondence there may be on the subject of the *chaudhriat ináms* in the Siálkot District.

No. $\frac{2259}{B. V. 9}$, dated 31st July 1895.

From—S. S. Thorburn, Esquire, Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division,

To—R. Sykes, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab.

In reply to your letter No. 3836, dated 10th instant, I have the honor to state that there has been no correspondence on the subject of the *chaudhriat ináms* during the current settlement that can be referred to.

2. These *ináms* fall under Circular No. 39 of the Punjab Revenue Circulars. During the currency of settlement, the Settlement Collector referred to me for instructions several cases of succession to these *ináms*.

These *ináms* are enjoyed by some of the zaildárs representing old families of chaudhris, also by other influential agriculturists. During the general revision of assignments under instructions from me which were based on the* provisions of the Revenue Circular quoted above, the Settlement Collector has directed that all of these *ináms* will merge into *zamíndári ináms* as they lapse by death, &c., of the present holder.

No. 5208, dated 21st September 1895.

From—R. Sykes, Esquire, Senior Secretary to Financial Commissioner, Punjab,

To—The Commissioner and Superintendent, Ráwalpindi Division.

With reference to correspondence on the subject of the *ála-lambardári* system in the Siálkot District, ending with your letter No. $\frac{2259}{B. V. 9}$, dated the 31st July 1895, I am directed to forward, for your information and for favour of communication to the Deputy Commissioner of Siálkot, a copy of the rules on the subject which the Financial Commissioner has sanctioned for adoption in the Siálkot District.

2. I am to say that Government has been asked to extend Rules 173 and 174 of the rules under the land Revenue Act to the Siálkot District. As soon as this has been sanctioned, the correspondence regarding the *ála-lambardári* arrangements in the districts which were settled under Mr. Prinsep's directions will be printed as a selection copy of this office and copies will be distributed as may be required.

Rules applicable to the Siálkot District regarding the appointments of ála-lambardárs and zamíndári inámdárs.

(*a*). The post of ála-lambardár will be abolished in all villages with less than three adna-lambardárs.

(*b*). Not more than one ála-lambardár will be retained or appointed in any revenue estate.

(*c*). Reductions under rules (*a*) and (*b*) will take effect from the death of the existing incumbents.

(*d*). As each individual *ála-lambardári* comes under reduction the *ála-lambardári* cess will cease to be levied.

(*e*). The *ála-lambardári ináms* which have already during re-assessment been substituted for *ála-lambardári máfís* granted originally by Mr. Prinsep, are to be enjoyed by all ála-lambardárs for the time being.

(*f*). Upon the abolition of an *ála-lambardári* appointment in any village, the *inám* attached thereto will be absorbed in the general fund of the *zail* in which the village is situated, from which the *sufed-poshi ináms* are to be met.

(*g*). All lapsed *ála-lambardári ináms* and certain grants dating from the last settlement, of the nature of *chaudhriat ináms*, will be funded by *zails*; and from this fund one or more *ináms* will be constituted which will be given to deserving zamíndárs

* Rule III, para. 1; also para. 4 of the Circular.

who will be selected by the Deputy Commissioner. The number and amount of these *ináms* will vary with the income of the fund in each *zail*, but the maximum amount of any one *inám* will not exceed Rs. 50, or with the sanction of the Commissioner Rs. 80, and the minimum amount will not be less than Rs. 30 per annum.

(*h*). *Zamíndári ináms* shall not be conferred on ála-lambardárs or zaildárs without the sanction of the Financial Commissioner, and in no case shall one man hold more than one *inám*.

(*i*). Rules 173 and 174 under the Land Revenue Act shall apply to the inámdárs of the Siálkot District.

Punjab Government Gazette Notification No. 193, dated the [illegible] of October 1895.

WITH reference to Rule 172 of the rules under the Punjab Land Revenue Act (XVII of 1887), the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to extend and hereby extends Rules 173 and 174 of the rules under the said Act relating to inámdárs, to the Siálkot District.

NEW SERIES No. 18.

SELECTIONS FROM THE RECORDS

OF THE OFFICE OF THE

FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB.

Published by Authority.

No. 44.

CONTENTS.

LXXII.—Papers relating to the Ala-Lambardari Inams in Six Districts of the Lahore and Rawalpindi Divisions.

Lahore:
THE "CIVIL AND MILITARY GAZETTE" PRESS.
Contractors to the Punjab Government.
1896.